


THE HUMAN ELEMENT
IN THE GOSPELS

GEORGE SALMON, D.D.



Division BS2569
Section .5172

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN THE GOSPELS

A COMMENTARY ON THE SYNOPTIC
NARRATIVE

By
GEORGE SALMON, D.D., F.R.S.

LATE PROVOST OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN

EDITED BY
NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D.

CANON OF ST PATRICK'S
AND PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY

1907

Printed in Great Britain.

EDITOR'S PREFACE

THOSE who read this book will not require from the Editor's Preface anything more than an account of the relation of the printed volume to the Author's manuscript.

In January 1905 the notes on the Synoptic Narrative which Dr Salmon had left were placed in my hands with a view to their publication if I should consider them to be in a sufficiently completed state. I found that there were two sets of note books, marked A and B respectively; the former consisting of thirteen volumes, the latter of seventeen, besides a book containing what I have here printed as the Author's Preface. A and B represent the first and second drafts of Dr Salmon's notes; the second draft stops abruptly at a point noted on p. 510 of this volume.

On careful consideration, I came to the conclusion that the second draft was, on the whole, the worthier presentation of Dr Salmon's views, although it appears from a note in one of the volumes that he was not altogether satisfied on this point himself. It is possible that if he had lived to go over the work again he would have somewhat modified the arrangement of the matter; but there

is no reason to suppose that he would have altered any of his critical conclusions.

It is to be observed that the printed volume is an abridgment of the manuscript. The work was designed to be an essay in the Higher Criticism; that is to say, it is an investigation of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels; and in such a work philological notes and discussions on various readings are strictly speaking only admissible when it can be shown that they affect decisions on questions of Higher Criticism. Consequently, I have thought it best to omit many such notes and discussions. They were not distributed uniformly throughout the manuscript, and in all probability they were not intended by the author for ultimate publication, but rather were written down as material for reflection. Dr Salmon, if I may judge from this MS., used the pen as a stimulus to thought. In these two drafts of notes every word of the Greek text of St Mark, with the parallels in the other Gospels, is copied out by his own hand;¹ and the same motive, as it would seem, suggested the repetition in suitable places of matter already published in his *Introduction*. This of course has also been cut out. But I desire that it should be clearly understood that with the exceptions I have noted, which are in fact not significant, there has been no suppression whatever of critical judgments; and, beyond the correction of obvious slips of the pen, no alteration has been

¹ See note on p. 19.

made in the wording. What is here presented to the reading public is all Dr Salmon's own, and wholly fresh.

Higher Criticism is not directly concerned with exegesis; and I may be charged with inconsistent treatment of the MS., in having printed so much exegetical matter. The reader will readily pardon this inconsistency; for I venture to think that significant as are Dr Salmon's critical conclusions, the exegesis and *obiter dicta* contained in this volume are more characteristic of the man, and will appeal to a wider circle. Those who have read his other works and sermons, or who had the privilege of personal intercourse with him, know how Dr Salmon's humorous wisdom and common sense, expressed with unconventional simplicity and directness, were wont to clear an entangled argument or illuminate an obscurity. The present work will supply many examples of this characteristic, which was especially his own.

Those who are acquainted with Dr Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament* will probably feel some degree of surprise at some of the opinions expressed in this work, especially as regards the Fourth Gospel. Some may think it reasonable to hold that the truest presentation of the great critic's mind is to be found in the conclusions, which Dr Salmon honestly arrived at when he was a younger man. On this matter I need not offer any opinion. My present business, as I conceive it, is to see through the Press, as accurately as I can,

the work of my revered and honoured teacher, not to criticise it. I must, however, remind those to whom Dr Salmon's last decisions will be unwelcome, that the views here expressed are the spontaneous and untrammelled judgments of a trained and powerful intellect on an entirely fresh study of the Gospels. His intellect had been nurtured on the broad culture of what used to be known as University education, an education which had at least this merit that it was favourable to the development of a sense of proportion in the judgment of a man who profited by it.

Moreover, although this work is not only posthumous but incomplete, from the standpoint of the author's design, it cannot be said to betray the weakness of old age, notwithstanding the pathetic confession in the Author's Preface. The studies, of which this book is the outcome, were taken up at a time when Dr Salmon's intellect and personality profoundly impressed all who came into contact with him. For several years before his death, Dr Salmon may be said to have devoted his thoughts and serious study almost altogether to the Synoptic Problem. He talked and corresponded with scholars who were interested in the same or similar studies, in particular with the eminent theologians who are now the Deans of Westminster and of St Patrick's. And yet he felt strangely alone amongst men of a younger generation, whose minds had grown up in an environment of belief so different in some respects from that of his own

youth. It is difficult for us now to place ourselves in the times when

*our Essays-and-Reviews' debate
Began to tell on the public mind,
And Colenso's words had weight.*

The feeling of aloneness, which is one of the trials of old age, is accentuated in the case of one who has passed through a stage of transition in religious thought, and who may be easily pardoned if he exaggerates the width of the chasm between the old and the new. He is tempted to feel that he has lost the companionship, not only of his old friends, but of his old self. As an illustration of this feeling I think that the following note, written on the fly leaf of one of his MS. note-books, is of profound interest. The note is on a quotation from a current number of the *Spectator*.

“Every person who meditates much upon anything and never discusses it usually becomes upon that subject so separate that his fellow-men fail to understand him.”—*Spectator*, 8th October 1898, p. 486.

And the note is as follows:—

“I have meditated much on the subject of these papers; I have not discussed them with others: With some, because their sympathies would be as much opposed to my views, as my own originally were, and because I have no right to throw them out of their present mental position without being sure of being able to offer them a better one; with others, because I should only encourage them

to go further in the same direction than I am prepared to follow or to sympathise with."

This somewhat pathetic tone of uneasiness, however, only affected, in his case, literary problems connected with our most holy faith. Those who really knew George Salmon do not need to be told, and those who read this book will see for themselves, that his faith in all that concerns the Christian life was founded upon a rock.

The Greek text printed in this book is that of Westcott and Hort, except in a very few cases where readings preferred by Dr Salmon are commented on. I have noted above that Dr Salmon had written out the whole of the Greek text before each section; and if I had retained all his notes on the minute variations between the Evangelic records it would have been desirable to print the Greek all through. But there did not seem any adequate reason for doing so in cases where the comment following did not of necessity compel immediate attention to the original text.

It remains that I should express my sincere thanks to the Rev. R. M. Gwynn, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and to the Rev. Canon H. V. White, Treasurer of St Patrick's Cathedral, who have kindly assisted me in reading the proofs of this book.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN,

16th January 1907.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|----------------------------|------|
| EDITOR'S PREFACE | v |
| AUTHOR'S PREFACE | i |
| INTRODUCTION | 13 |

| SUBJECT | Mark | REFERENCES Matt. | Luke | |
|---|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-----|
| PROLOGUE OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL. | | | | |
| Mark i. 1-13 | | | | 33 |
| THE TITLE OF THE BOOK | i. 1 | | | 33 |
| THE APPEARANCE OF THE BAPTIST . i. 2-4 | | iii. 1-3 | iii. 2-6 | 40 |
| " " " " " " " | | xi. 10 | vii. 27 | |
| " " " " " " " | i. 5-6 | iii. 4-6 | | 47 |
| THE PREACHING OF THE BAPTIST | | iii. 7-10 | iii. 7-9 | 48 |
| " " " " " " " | | | iii. 10-16a | |
| JOHN'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE MESSIAH i. 7, 8 | | iii. 11, 12 | iii. 16b-18 | 51 |
| " " " " " " " | | John i. 27 | | |
| THE BAPTISM OF JESUS | i. 9 | iii. 13 | iii. 21a | 54 |
| " " " " " " " | | iii. 14, 15 | | |
| " " " " " " " | i. 10, 11 | iii. 16, 17 | iii. 21b, 22 | 55 |
| THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS i. 12 | | iv. 1 | iv. 1 | 59 |
| " " " " " " " | i. 13 | iv. 2-11 | iv. 2-13 | 61 |
| THE FIRST PREACHING BY JESUS . i. 14, 15 | | iv. 12-17 | iv. 14, 15 | 75 |
| THE CALLING OF PETER AND ANDREW, JAMES AND JOHN . i. 16-20 | | iv. 18-22 | v. 1-11 | 83 |
| THE SYNAGOGUE OF CAPERNAUM . i. 21a | | | iv. 31a | 88 |
| " " " " " " " | i. 21b | | iv. 31b | 89 |
| " " " " " " " | i. 22 | vii. 28b, 29 | iv. 32 | 89 |
| THE MIRACLE IN THE SYNAGOGUE i. 23 | | | iv. 33 | 93 |
| " " " " " " " | i. 24 | | iv. 34 | 94 |
| " " " " " " " | i. 25, 26 | | iv. 35 | 97 |
| THE EFFECT OF THE MIRACLE | i. 27 | | iv. 36 | 98 |
| " " " " " " " | i. 28 | | iv. 37, 14 | 99 |
| PETER'S WIFE'S MOTHER | i. 29 | viii. 14a | iv. 38a | 99 |
| " " " " " " " | i. 30, 31 | viii. 14b, 15 | iv. 38b, 39 | 100 |

| SUBJECT | REFERENCES | | | PAGE |
|---|------------|--|-----------------------------------|------|
| | Mark | Matt. | Luke | |
| THE CROWD ROUND THE DOOR IN THE EVENING. | i. 32-34 | viii. 16, 17 | iv. 40, 41 | 103 |
| JESUS LEAVES CAPERNAUM | i. 35-38 | | iv. 42, 43 | 106 |
| " " | i. 39 | | iv. 44 | 107 |
| THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT— | | | | |
| PRELIMINARY REMARKS | | | | 109 |
| " " | | v. 1, 2 | vi. 20a | 110 |
| I. THE BEATITUDES. Matt. v. 3-12 . | | v. 3-12 | vi. 20b-26 | 112 |
| II. THE INFLUENCE OF THE CITIZENS OF THE KINGDOM. Matt. v. 13-16 . | ix. 50 | v. 13 | xiv. 34, 35 | 117 |
| " " " . | iv. 21, 22 | v. 15 | {viii. 16, 17 } {xi. 33 } | 118 |
| III. THE AUTHORITY OF THE MOSAIC LAW. Matt. v. 17-20 | | | | 119 |
| " " " . | | v. 18 | xvi. 17 | 121 |
| IV. THE EXTENSION OF THE MOSAIC LAW. Matt. v. 21-48 | | | | 121 |
| (a) <i>The Law of Murder.</i> Matt. v. 21-26 | | v. 25, 26 | xii. 58, 59 | 121 |
| (b) <i>The Law of Adultery.</i> Matt. v. 27-30 | ix. 43-47 | {v. 29, 30 } {xviii. 8, 9 } {xix. 12 } | | 125 |
| (c) <i>The Law of Divorce.</i> Matt. v. 31, 32 | x. 2-12 | {v. 31, 32 } {xix. 3-12 } | | 128 |
| (d) <i>The Law of Perjury.</i> Matt. v. 33-37 | | | | 132 |
| (e) <i>The Law of Revenge.</i> Matt. v. 38-42 | | | | 132 |
| " " " . | | v. 40 | vi. 29b | 133 |
| " " " . | | v. 39 | vi. 29a | |
| " " " . | | v. 42 | vi. 35a | 134 |
| (f) <i>The Law of Enmity.</i> Matt. v. 43-48 | | v. 44 | vi. 27, 28 | 135 |
| " " " . | | v. 45 | vi. 35b | 136 |
| " " " . | | v. 46, 47 | vi. 32-34 | |
| " " " . | | v. 48 | vi. 36 | 137 |
| V. ACTS OF DEVOTION. Matt. vi. 1-18 . | | | | 137 |
| (a) <i>Almsgiving.</i> Matt. vi. 1-4 | | | | |
| (b) <i>Prayer.</i> Matt. vi. 5-15. | | vi. 9-13 | xi. 1-4 | 138 |
| " " " . | xi. 25(26) | {vi. 14, 15 } {xviii. 35 } | | |
| (c) <i>Fasting.</i> Matt. vi. 16-18 | | | | |
| VI. TRUST IN GOD. Matt. vi. 19-34. . | | vi. 19-21 | xii. 33, 34 | 139 |
| " " " . | | vi. 22, 23 | xi. 34-36 | 140 |
| " " " . | | vi. 24 | xvi. 13 | |
| " " " . | | vi. 25-34 | xii. 22-31 | 141 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

XV

| SUBJECT | Mark | REFERENCES Matt. | Luke | PAGE |
|--|------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT | | | | |
| (continued)— | | | | |
| VII. CONDUCT, DANGERS. Matt. vii. 1-27. | iv. 24 | vii. 1, 2 | vi. 37, 38 | 141 |
| „ „ „ | | vii. 3-5 | vi. 41, 42 | 142 |
| „ „ „ | | vii. 7-11 | xi. 9-13 | |
| „ „ „ | | vii. 12 | vi. 31 | |
| <i>Enter ye in by the narrow gate</i> . | | vii. 13a | xiii. 24a | 143 |
| <i>Beware of false prophets. Deeds not words.</i> Matt. vii. 15-27 . | | vii. 16a, 20 | vi. 44a | 143, 144 |
| „ „ „ | | vii. 16b | vi. 44b | |
| „ „ „ | | { vii. 17, 18 } { xii. 33 } | vi. 43 | |
| „ „ „ | | { vii. 19 } { iii. 10 } | iii. 9 | |
| „ „ „ | | vii. 21 | vi. 46 | |
| „ „ „ | | vii. 22, 23 | xiii. 25-27 | |
| „ „ „ | | vii. 24-27 | vi. 47-49 | 144 |
| THE HEALING OF THE LEPER . | | viii. 1 | | 146 |
| „ „ „ | i. 40 | viii. 2 | v. 12 | 148 |
| „ „ „ | i. 41-44 | viii. 3, 4 | v. 13, 14 | 149 |
| „ „ „ | i. 45 | | v. 15, 16 | 151 |
| THE CENTURION'S SERVANT . | | viii. 5-10 | vii. 1-10 | 152 |
| „ „ „ | | viii. 11, 12 | xiii. 28, 29 | 156 |
| THE PARALYTIC MAN . . . | ii. 1-12 | ix. 1-8 | v. 17-26 | 157 |
| THE CALLING OF THE PUBLICAN | ii. 13, 14 | ix. 9 | v. 27, 28 | 164 |
| THE PUBLICAN'S FEAST . . . | ii. 15-17 | ix. 10-13 | v. 29-32 | 167 |
| THE QUESTION ABOUT FASTING | ii. 18-22 | ix. 14-17 | v. 33-38 | 171 |
| THE WALK THROUGH THE CORN- FIELDS | ii. 23-28 | xii. 1-4, 8 | vi. 1-5 | 174 |
| „ „ „ | | xii. 5-7 | | |
| THE MAN WITH THE WITHERED HAND | iii. 1-6 | xii. 9-14 | vi. 6-11 | 177 |
| „ „ „ | | xii. 11, 12 | { xiv. 5 } { xiii. 15 } | 181 |
| OUR LORD'S CHANGE OF HIS SCENE OF LABOUR | iii. 7a | xii. 15a | | 182 |
| THE CROWDS | iii. 7b-12 | { iv. 24, 25 } { xii. 15b, 16 } | vi. 17-19 | 185 |
| THE APPOINTMENT OF THE TWELVE | iii. 13-15 | x. 1 | vi. 12, 13 | 186 |

| SUBJECT | REFERENCES | | LUKE | PAGE |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------|
| | Mark | Matt. | | |
| THE NAMES OF THE APOSTLES | iii. 16-19a | x. 2-4 | vi. 14-16 | 194 |
| THE SEVENTY | | | | 200 |
| CHARGES MADE BY OUR LORD'S | | | | |
| ENEMIES | iii. 19b-21 | | | 202 |
| THE CHARGE OF CASTING OUT | | | | |
| DEVIL'S BY BEELZEBUB | iii. 22-26 | { xii. 22-28 ix. 32-34 } | xi. 14-20 | 205 |
| " | | xii. 27, 28 | xi. 19, 20 | 208 |
| " | iii. 27 | xii. 29 | xi. 21, 22 | 210 |
| " | | xii. 30 | xi. 23 | 210 |
| " | iii. 28-30 | xii. 31, 32 | xii. 10 | 210 |
| OUR LORD'S MOTHER AND HIS | | | | |
| BRETHREN | iii. 31-35 | xii. 46-50 | viii. 19-21 | 213 |
| THE DEMAND OF A SIGN FROM | | | | |
| HEAVEN | | xii. 38-40 | xi. 16, 29, 30 | 216 |
| " | viii. 11, 12 | xvi. 1, 2a, 4 | | |
| " | | xii. 41, 42 | xi. 31, 32 | 219 |
| WEATHER SIGNS | | xvi. 2b, 3 | | 220 |
| " | | | xii. 54-57 | 221 |
| THE RELAPSED DEMONIAK | | xii. 43-45 | xi. 24-26 | 222 |
| THE MESSAGE OF THE BAPTIST | | xi. 2, 3 | vii. 18-20 | 226 |
| OUR LORD'S ANSWER TO JOHN'S | | | | |
| DISCIPLES | | xi. 4-6 | vii. 21-23 | 231 |
| OUR LORD'S DISCOURSE CONCERNING | | | | |
| JOHN | | xi. 7-11 | vii. 24-28, 29, 30 | 232 |
| " | | xi. 12, 13 | xvi. 16 | 232 |
| " | | xi. 14, 15 | | 235 |
| THE CHILDREN IN THE MARKET PLACE | | xi. 16-19 | vii. 31-35 | 237 |
| OUR LORD'S TEACHING BY THE | | | | |
| LAKE | | | | 240 |
| PARABLE OF THE SOWER | iv. 1, 2 | xiii. 1-3a | viii. 4 | 242 |
| THE WAYSIDE | iv. 3, 4 | xiii. 3b, 4 | viii. 5 | 244 |
| " THE EXPLANATION | iv. 14, 15 | xiii. 19 | viii. 11b, 12 | 245 |
| THE ROCKY GROUND | iv. 5, 6 | xiii. 5, 6 | viii. 6 | 247 |
| " THE EXPLANATION | iv. 16, 17 | xiii. 20, 21 | viii. 13 | 247 |
| THE THORNS | iv. 7 | xiii. 7 | viii. 7 | 248 |
| " THE EXPLANATION | iv. 18, 19 | xiii. 22 | viii. 14 | 248 |
| THE GOOD GROUND | iv. 8, 9 | xiii. 8, 9 | viii. 8 | 249 |
| " THE EXPLANATION | iv. 20 | xiii. 23 | viii. 15 | 249 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xvii

| SUBJECT | Mark | REFERENCES Matt. | Luke | PAGE |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|
| THE REASON FOR OUR LORD'S METHOD OF TEACHING BY PARABLES | iv. 10-13 | xiii. 10-15 | viii. 9, 10 | 250 |
| THE CANDLE AND THE BUSHEL | iv. 21-23 | | viii. 16, 17 | 256 |
| " " " " | | v. 15 | xi. 33 | 257 |
| " " " " | | x. 26-33 | xii. 2-4 <i>a</i> | 257 |
| THE LAW OF RECIPROCITY | iv. 24, 25 | xiii. 12 | viii. 18 | 258 |
| " " " " | | vii. 2 | vi. 38 | 259 |
| " " " " | | xxv. 29 | xix. 26 | 260 |
| THE SEED GROWING SECRETLY | iv. 26-29 | | | 260 |
| THE GRAIN OF MUSTARD SEED | iv. 30-32 | xiii. 31, 32 | xiii. 18, 19 | 262 |
| THE LEAVEN | | xiii. 33 | xiii. 20, 21 | 262 |
| " " " " | iv. 33, 34 | xiii. 34, 35 | | 263 |
| THE CROSSING OF THE LAKE | iv. 35, 36 | viii. 18, 23 | viii. 22 | 264 |
| THE STORM ON THE LAKE | iv. 37-41 | viii. 24-27 | viii. 23-25 | 265 |
| OUR LORD'S WOULD-BE FOL- LOWERS | | viii. 19-22 | ix. 57-60 | 267 |
| " " " " | | | ix. 61, 62 | |
| THE DEMONIAK IN THE TOMBS | v. 1, 2 | viii. 28 <i>a</i> | viii. 26, 27 <i>a</i> | 268 |
| THE DEMONIAK'S PREVIOUS HISTORY | v. 3-5 | viii. 28 <i>b</i> | viii. 27 <i>b</i> , 29 <i>b</i> | 272 |
| THE MEETING OF JESUS WITH THE DEMONIAK. | v. 6-10 | viii. 29 | {viii. 28, 29 <i>a</i> , 30, 31} | 273 |
| THE DEMONS AND THE SWINE | v. 11-13 | viii. 30-32 | viii. 32, 33 | 274 |
| THE CURE OF THE DEMONIAK: THE SEQUEL | v. 14-20 | viii. 33, 34 | viii. 34-39 | 279 |
| THERETURN: JAIKUS' DAUGHTER | v. 21-24 <i>a</i> | ix. 18, 19 | viii. 40-42 <i>a</i> | 281 |
| THE WOMAN WITH THE ISSUE OF BLOOD | v. 24 <i>b</i> -34 | ix. 20-22 | viii. 42 <i>b</i> -48 | 283 |
| JAIKUS' DAUGHTER, THE SECOND MESSAGE | v. 35-37 | | viii. 49-51 | 284 |
| JAIKUS' DAUGHTER: THE MIRACLE. | v. 38-43 | ix. 23-26 | viii. 52-56 | 285 |
| THE VISIT TO NAZARETH | vi. 1-6 <i>a</i> | xiii. 53-58 | | 73, 287 |
| THE SENDING OUT OF THE APOSTLES | vi. 6 <i>b</i> | ix. 35 <i>a</i> | | 290 |
| " " " " | {vi. 7, 12, 13} | x. 1 | ix. 1, 2 | 291 |
| " " " " | | x. 5 <i>b</i> , 6 | | |
| " " " " | | x. 7 | {ix. 2, 6} {x. 9, 11} | 292 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | SUBJECT | Mark | REFERENCES | | PAGE |
|--|---------|------------|--------------|--------------|------|
| | | | Matt. | Luke | |
| OFFENCES | | ix. 42 | xviii. 6 | xvii. 2 | 384 |
| „ | | | xviii. 7 | xvii. 1 | 385 |
| „ | | ix. 43-48 | xviii. 8, 9 | | 386 |
| „ | | ix. 49, 50 | | | |
| THE DEPARTURE FROM GALILEE | | x. 1 | xix. 1, 2 | | 389 |
| THE QUESTION OF DIVORCE | | x. 2 | xix. 3 | | 390 |
| „ „ | | x. 3-9 | xix. 4-8 | | 392 |
| „ „ | | x. 10-12 | xix. 9-12 | | 393 |
| THE BLESSING OF THE LITTLE CHILDREN | | x. 13-16 | xix. 13-15 | xviii. 15-17 | 395 |
| THE RICH YOUNG MAN | | x. 17-22 | xix. 16-22 | xviii. 18-23 | 396 |
| OUR LORD'S REFLECTIONS ON THE RICH MAN'S REFUSAL | | x. 23-27 | xix. 23-26 | xviii. 24-27 | 412 |
| PETER'S CLAIM | | x. 28-31 | xix. 27-30 | xviii. 28-30 | 416 |
| „ | | | xix. 28 | xxii. 29, 30 | |
| „ | | x. 32-34 | xx. 17-19 | xviii. 31-34 | 418 |
| THE REQUEST OF THE SONS OF ZEBEDEE | | x. 35-40 | xx. 20-23 | | 419 |
| THE MUTUAL JEALOUSIES OF THE APOSTLES | | x. 41-45 | xx. 24-28 | | 420 |
| THE HEALING OF THE BLIND MAN AT JERICHO | | x. 46-52 | xx. 29-34 | xviii. 35-43 | 422 |
| „ „ | | | ix. 27-31 | | 423 |
| ✓ THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY | | xi. 1-11 | xxi. 1-11 | xix. 28-40 | 424 |
| ✓ THE BARREN FIG TREE. | | xi. 12-14 | xxi. 18, 19 | | 429 |
| ✓ THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE | | xi. 15-18 | xxi. 12-17 | xix. 45-48 | 431 |
| THE CONTINUATION OF THE STORY OF THE FIG TREE | | xi. 19-26 | xxi. 20-22 | | 437 |
| „ „ | | | xvii. 20 | xvii. 6 | |
| ✓ THE CHALLENGE OF OUR LORD'S AUTHORITY | | xi. 27, 28 | xxi. 23 | xx. 1, 2 | 438 |
| OUR LORD'S REPLY TO THE CHALLENGE OF HIS AUTHORITY | | xi. 29, 30 | xxi. 24, 25a | xx. 3, 4 | 440 |
| „ „ | | xi. 31-33 | xxi. 25b-27 | xx. 5-8 | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xxi

| SUBJECT | Mark | REFERENCES Matt. | Luke | PAGE |
|---|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|
| THE PARABLE OF THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN . . . | xii. 1a | xxi. 33a | xx. 9a | 442 |
| „ „ | xii. 1b | xxi. 33b | xx. 9b | 443 |
| „ „ | xii. 2-5 | xxi. 34-36 | xx. 10-12 | |
| „ „ | xii. 6-11 | xxi. 37-42 | xx. 13-17 | 444 |
| „ „ | | xxi. 43 | | 445 |
| „ „ | | xxi. 44 | xx. 18 | 446 |
| „ „ | xii. 12 | xxi. 45, 46 | xx. 19 | |
| THE TRIBUTE MONEY . . . | xii. 13-17 | xxii. 15-22 | xx. 20-26 | 447 |
| THE SADDUCEES' QUESTION . . . | xii. 18-23 | xxii. 23-28 | xx. 27-33 | 451 |
| OUR LORD'S ANSWER . . . | xii. 24-27 | xxii. 29-33 | xx. 34-40 | 452 |
| THE GREAT COMMANDMENT . . . | xii. 28-34 | xxii. 34-40 | | 454 |
| „ „ | | | x. 25-29 | 455 |
| OUR LORD'S OWN QUESTION . . . | xii. 35-37 | xxii. 41-46 | xx. 41-44 | 457 |
| THE HYPOCRISY OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES . . . | xii. 38-40 | xxiii. 6, 7 | xx. 45-47 | 459 |
| „ „ „ | | | xi. 43 | |
| THE WIDOW'S MITE . . . | xii. 41-44 | | xxi. 1-4 | 460 |
| THE PAROUSIA DISCOURSE . . . | xiii. 1, 2 | xxiv. 1, 2 | xxi. 5, 6 | 461 |
| „ „ | xiii. 3, 4 | xxiv. 3 | xxi. 7 | 462 |
| THE FIRST STAGE . . . | xiii. 5-8 | xxiv. 4-8 | xxi. 8-11 | 463 |
| THE SECOND STAGE . . . | xiii. 9, 10 | { x. 17, 18 } { xxiv. 9-14 } | xxi. 12, 13 | 464 |
| „ . . . | xiii. 11-13 | x. 19-22 | { xii. 11, 12 } { xxi. 14-19 } | 466 |
| „ . . . | xiii. 14-16 | xxiv. 15-18 | xxi. 20-22 | 469 |
| „ . . . | | | xvii. 31 | 470 |
| „ . . . | xiii. 17-20 | xxiv. 19-22 | xxi. 23 | 471 |
| „ . . . | xiii. 21-23 | { xxiv. 23-25, } { 26-28 } | { xvii. 23, } { 24, 27 } | 472 |
| „ . . . | xiii. 24-27 | xxiv. 29-31 | xxi. 25-28 | 473 |
| THE FIG TREE PARABLE . . . | xiii. 28, 29 | xxiv. 32, 33 | xxi. 29-31 | 474 |
| THE TIME OF THE SECOND COMING . . . | xiii. 30-32 | xxiv. 34-36 | xxi. 32, 33 | 475 |
| „ „ | | xxiv. 37-41 | { xvii. 26-30 } { 34-36 } | 477 |
| EXHORTATION TO WATCHFULNESS . . . | xiii. 33-37 | { xxiv. 42 } { xxv. 13 } | | 477 |
| „ „ | | xxiv. 43, 44 | xii. 39, 40 | 478 |
| „ „ | | xxiv. 14-55 | xii. 42-46 | 479 |

| SUBJECT | Mark | REFERENCES Matt. | Luke | PAGE |
|---|-------------|--|--|------|
| THE LAST PASSOVER | xiv. 1, 2 | xxvi. 1-5 | xxii. 1, 2 | 480 |
| THE ANOINTING OF OUR LORD'S FEET | xiv. 3-9 | xxvi. 6-13 | vii. 36-40 | 481 |
| „ „ | | | John xii. 1-8 | |
| THE TREACHERY OF JUDAS | xiv. 10, 11 | xxvi. 14-16 | xxii. 3-6 | 487 |
| THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE PASSOVER | xiv. 12-16 | xxvi. 17-19 | xxii. 7-13 | 488 |
| THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF TREASON | xiv. 17-21 | xxvi. 20-25 | xxii. 14, 21-23 | 490 |
| THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCCHARIST | xiv. 22-29 | xxvi. 26-30 | xxii. 15-20, 39 | |
| THE WARNING TO PETER | xiv. 27-31 | xxvi. 31-35 | xxii. 31-34 | 494 |
| „ „ | | | John xiii. 36-38 | |
| GETHSEMANE | xiv. 32-42 | xxvi. 36-46 | xxii. 40-46 | 495 |
| THE CAPTURE | xiv. 43-52 | xxvi. 47-56 | xxii. 47-53 | 498 |
| THE TRIAL | xiv. 53, 54 | xxvi. 57, 58 | xxii. 54, 55 | 500 |
| „ | xiv. 55-59 | xxvi. 59-61 | | |
| THE SENTENCE OF CONDEM- NATION | xiv. 60-65 | xxvi. 62-68 | xxii. 63-71 | 502 |
| THE DENIAL OF PETER . . | xiv. 66-72 | xxvi. 69-75 | xxii. 56-62 | 507 |
| THE REFERENCE TO PILATE | xv. 1 | xxvii. 1, 2 | xxiii. 1, 2 | 509 |
| THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE . | xv. 2-5 | xxvii. 11-14 | xxiii. 3-5 | 510 |
| JESUS OR BARABBAS . . . | xv. 6-11 | { xxvii. 15- 18, 20 } | xxiii. 13-19 | 513 |
| THE SENTENCE OF PILATE . . | xv. 12-15 | { xxvii. 21- 23, 26 } | xxiii. 20-25 | 514 |
| THE MOCKING BY THE SOLDIERS | xv. 16-20 | xxvii. 27-31 | | |
| THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE CRUCIFIXION | xv. 21-23 | xxvii. 32-34 | xxiii. 26 | 516 |
| THE CRUCIFIXION | xv. 24-32 | xxvii. 35-44 | xxiii. 32-43 | 517 |
| THE MIRACULOUS DARKNESS . | xv. 33 | xxvii. 45 | xxiii. 44, 45 ^a | 519 |
| THE COMPLAINT OF FORSAKENNESS | xv. 34-36 | xxvii. 46-49 | xxiii. 44 ^b , 46 ^a | 520 |
| THE DEATH | xv. 37-39 | { xxvii. 50, } 51 ^a , 54 } | xxiii. 45 ^b -47 | 522 |
| THE WOMEN AT THE CROSS | xv. 40, 41 | xxvii. 55, 56 | xxiii. 48, 49 | 525 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xxiii

| SUBJECT | Mark | REFERENCES | | PAGE |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|------|
| | | Matt. | Luke | |
| THE BURIAL | xv. 42-47 | xxvii. 57-61 | xxiii. 50-56 | 526 |
| THE NEWS OF THE RESURREC- | | | | |
| TION. | xvi. 1-8 | xxviii. 1-10 | xxiv. 1-11 | 528 |
| INDEX OF PERSONS AND SUBJECTS | . | . | . | 533 |
| VARIOUS READINGS | . | . | . | 537 |
| INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES | . | . | . | 539 |

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THE question of the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels is one in which for several years I have taken interest; at least so far as to make myself acquainted with different speculations on the subject, and to form some judgment of my own on the arguments offered on behalf of them. But it is only within comparatively few years that I have given the subject serious study of my own. What led me to give these problems more systematic investigation was the impression made on me by the growing adoption of opinions concerning the authorship of Old Testament books at variance not only with the views in which I had been brought up, but with the doctrine taught in the Christian Church ever since the time of the Apostles. It was suggested to me that I should take part in the controversy by writing in defence of traditional opinions; but this was a work which I did not feel myself competent to undertake. It is ill for amateurs to contend with experts; and I should be under a hopeless disadvantage if, relying on my amateur knowledge of the Hebrew language and literature, obtained casually and intermittently in the midst of other pursuits which had more attraction for me, I ventured to contend with men who had made these studies the business of their lives.

There was another reason why I considered myself unfit to discuss the authorship of the Old Testament

books, namely, that I felt I could not conduct the investigation with the necessary impartiality. I myself attach little value to any arguments that are only used to bring out a foregone conclusion. I did feel that I possessed this impartiality in investigating the authorship of New Testament books; because I believed that the credit of our religion was not pledged to any theory on this subject. It was no fundamental article of our faith that St Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, or that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Our belief in the truth of the facts recorded in the Gospels would not be affected by any uncertainty or error as to the traditional names of the compilers; because it was not on the credit of their names that our assent was given. Matthew, to whom the first is ascribed, was one of the least distinguished of the Apostles; of Mark and Luke we scarcely know anything, except as the authors of books accepted by the Christian community from times previous to historical record.

Yet I had learnt not to bow with too absolute submission to the decision of those who were in repute as experts. It is wonderful what an objection most men have to taking the trouble of forming opinions for themselves, and how eagerly they accept any authority that will dictate to them what views they ought to hold. No sooner is an old authority dethroned, than a new tyrant is set up in his place, whose doctrines must one adopt and defend on pain of being despised as too ignorant or too bigoted to be able to keep pace with the progress of thought. When I first began to study the question of the authorship of the New Testament books, Baur had not been long dead; but he had left a host of adherents who counted him an almost infallible guide. Those who followed

his methods, or improved on them, were proclaimed as *the best critics*; those who questioned his doctrines were dismissed as unworthy of serious consideration, being generally nick-named as *apologists*; the intention being to convey the idea that they had made no investigations except with the purpose of bringing out foregone conclusions. Yet I have lived to see a great shrinkage of the claims made for Baur's results even by the warmest of his admirers, many of whom now abandon as indefensible positions to contest which was once represented as a sign of ignorance or immodesty. I thought myself free therefore to postpone my acceptance of many modern opinions concerning Old Testament books until the questions had been more completely threshed out.

But it occurred to me that I might meanwhile do some useful work in experimenting what would be the result of equal freedom of criticism applied to the New Testament. Certainly I had no reason to complain that we have not found abundance of freedom used by modern New Testament critics; but those who have used most have seemed to me to be usually wanting in impartiality, and to be men who form their judgment with a bias against received opinions. Feeling myself to be quite free from any such bias, I was yet willing to try what the result would be of an impartial investigation of the composition of New Testament books, conducted with as complete independence of traditional opinions as has been obtained in the case of the Old Testament. My notion was to take the three Synoptic Gospels, and, putting aside all Church doctrine as to their inspiration or authority, discuss their mutual relations as a mere question of criticism, just as if they had been newly discovered documents of whose history we knew nothing. I do

not think that when I undertook this task I had fully understood what a sacrifice of previous sentiments it involved; and I shall not be surprised if many who look into this book content themselves with very slight acquaintance with it, and have little inclination to pursue the same study. For my own feelings, the books of the Gospels had a sacredness which Old Testament books had not; and it was painful to me to lay aside those feelings of reverence which had hitherto deterred me from too minute investigation. I felt as if I had been set to make a dissection of the body of my mother; and could not feel that the scientific value of the results I might obtain would repay me for the painful shock resulting from the very nature of the task.

No doubt the present generation has relaxed much of the strictness of that theory of verbal inspiration which regarded the smallest discordance between the statements of two sacred writers as a thing needing explanation or apology; and which could find deep mysteries in the use of one word rather than another which in popular use was its exact equivalent. For instance, no great importance would now be attached to the difficulty which commentators were at one time required to explain: that according to one Evangelist, the inscription over the cross was simply *The King of the Jews*, according to another *Jesus, the King of the Jews*, according to a third *Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews*; nor would it be felt as a great relief if it could be shown that the discrepancies were to be attributed not to the Evangelists, but to their transcribers. We should simply say that there never had been any reason to hold that it had been divinely intended that the Gospels should present absolute uniformity in such trifling details. Notwithstanding

this general laxity, there are many who would still find it a shock to have to acknowledge that in any particular case an Evangelist had either made a mistake or had consciously varied from the story that had been told him. Yet the possibility of such shocks is indispensable from the investigation on which we are entering. The question whether one Evangelist copied another is part of the general question, What authorities did the Evangelists use? If we find an answer to this question, we are led on to another, In what way did they use their authorities? What standard of accuracy are we fairly justified in expecting? Can we reasonably expect that any writer of the first century should work exactly in the same way as a historian of the nineteenth? that he should observe the scrupulous care which we now feel ourselves entitled to demand in not going in the slightest degree beyond what he had good authority for stating, and in not, without warning, mixing up inferences of his own with what he had learnt from other well-informed persons? It was at one time a shock to Christians to be told that our New Testament Scriptures were not written in the purest Attic Greek; and it required some discussion and apology to make men understand that if our sacred books had had the qualities which were alleged to be necessary to the perfection of divinely inspired Scripture, sound criticism would have obliged us to infer that the books could not have been written at the time or in the place to which we now refer them. Exactly the same thing might be maintained if we found the Gospels written with nineteenth-century punctiliousness. I have elsewhere (*Introd. N. T.*, p. 62) quoted the apology made by an editor of Longinus for his author's looseness of citation. He owns that in the whole book you could hardly find any passage accurately quoted, at least if

it contained more than three or four words. But he observes that all the other writers of the same date were equally careless ; and that if they put before their readers' eyes the general sense of the author cited, and two or three of the more remarkable words, they were indifferent about the rest : *Accurata hæc citandi diligentia, qua hodie utimur, quæque laudabilis sane est, frustra in veteribus quærenda est.* I cannot then help thinking that much time has been wasted on the verbal comparison of one Gospel with another ; and that some of the theories built on such comparison have no solid foundation, and that, even if the differences are not merely with respect to forms of expression, but extend to trifling details of facts, we are not justified in condemning either writer as an unfaithful historian, regard being had to the customary standard of his age.

There is another way in which the results of the investigation on which we are entering must give a shock to many readers. If we find what seem to be differences between the accounts of the same occurrence by different Evangelists, and if we decide that it is not necessary to force them into agreement, we have then to decide as to which account is the more probable ; and that is a question which, whether deliberately or not, we cannot help determining by the standards of our own age. I have disclaimed all sympathy with those with whom it is a foregone conclusion that nothing that can properly be called miracle ever occurred, and whose whole criticism is made with the polemical object of eliminating everything miraculous from the story ; some of them having proceeded beyond the doctrine that no miracle ever occurred to the doctrine that no one could ever have believed that it did. But nevertheless, if we are comparing two accounts of the same occurrence, we cannot help judging on the same principles as would

guide us if we were judging between two different accounts of a contemporary event. And in that case we naturally give a preference to the account most in harmony with our ordinary experience. Thus, without having any desire to eliminate miracle from the story, we may be led to account some things as non-miraculous which on a different system had been thought capable only of a supernatural interpretation.

There being much in the investigation on which I have entered which was at first repulsive to myself, and which I have no doubt will be equally so to many readers, I have had to ask myself, Why proceed with it at all? or at least, Why invite others to join in it? The study can yield no trustworthy results without a minute and tedious examination of many particulars; and no hasty conclusion can be safely adopted without examining how the solution suggested by one case will satisfy the others. I cannot wonder that men should shrink from all this labour if they find it to be what they regard as, in every sense of the words, *labor improbus*. As far as I am myself concerned, my plea for not abandoning the investigation on which I had entered is simply that I found too much fascination in it to be able to leave it. I have found nothing more interesting than this work of turning dead records into living history, as I tried to throw myself into the feelings and attitude of mind of those men of old whose story I read. The historians whose works I studied became to me living characters; *Mark* was no longer the mere name of an ancient document, but a real person, with his own mode of literary workmanship, whose style was as distinctly recognisable as was that of St Paul. I found myself constantly seeing more in long familiar words than I had ever seen in them before. It may be that other critics will count my fancied discoveries as

unsubstantial as I have myself regarded the speculations of other old men, in which they believed they were laying the foundation of a great reputation. But to myself, my discoveries are real, and I could not help treating them as if they were.

If I can recommend the study to others who have patience for it, it is because I consider that it gives us a firmer hold of the reality of the facts of the Gospel history. To one who has thus learnt to feel the personality of the Evangelists nothing can seem more ignorant than Goldwin Smith's verdict that the Gospels were written by nobody knows who, nobody knows when.¹ The *nobody knows who* is an unimportant matter. We get all our information about present-day history from newspapers, written by *nobody knows who*; nor do ordinary readers care much to enquire. Three at least of the Gospels bear strong marks of the personality of the writers; and our belief would be little affected if we should discover that their names, instead of being Mark, Luke, and John, were Jacob, Joseph, and Simon. But I cannot doubt that these writings present us with the story as told in the very first assemblies of Christians, by men who had been personal disciples of Jesus; nor do I think that the account of any of our Lord's miracles would have been very different if we could have the report of it as published in a Jerusalem newspaper next morning. Of all attempts to eliminate miracle from the Gospel history the expectation to do so by historical criticism of our sources is the vainest; for it proceeds on the assumption that the first reporters were less likely than we should be now to ascribe a supernatural origin to what they had witnessed.

¹ "Tradition of unknown origin recorded by unknown writers at a date uncertain and, for aught that we can tell, many years after the events." *Guesses at the Riddle of Existence*, p. 150.

The best defence of the study of the human element in the Gospels is that this human element is the real foundation of our faith. The cult of a Roman Catholic Saint, Philumena, in modern times has gained much extension ; but belief in her very existence has no other historical foundation than the statement of a holy nun that in a dream there had been revealed to her the true history of some relics which her bishop had brought from Rome. I do not think it important to discuss the logical question whether such a statement might not be a sufficient ground of evidence ; for it is enough to know that such evidence would not bring conviction to the minds of the majority of educated people in these islands at the present day, however mistaken they might be in their unbelief. And if our belief in the facts of the Gospel history is made to rest on the foundation that this or that Evangelist could not be mistaken in anything he asserts, there will be a continual growth of unbelief among many who will ask, What evidence there is of the inerrancy of Evangelists, unless we have first ascertained that the facts of the Gospel history are true? We shall find that in the last resort we come to depend on the human element in the Gospels, that is to say, on things that can be proved by ordinary historical testimony.

And yet the fact is that the immense value we attach to the divine element in the Gospels has had a tendency to make us indifferent or inattentive to the human element. If we know that all the books of Scripture have one and the same infallible Author, what importance is it to us to know through what, or through how many channels His communications are made? The statements made in one of the sacred books are undoubtedly accurate, and need no confirmation from any other of them. Even if instead of confirmation we find

apparent contradiction, we need not distress ourselves ; for the contradiction is sure to be only apparent. This has led to the paradoxical result that at the present day those who ascribe the highest authority to the Bible, and who have devoted their best years to the study of it, find themselves learning much from men who treat its books as ordinary literature ; and they have to own that they had never taken notice of much that less reverent readers can now point out to them.

The results that are hoped from this investigation are comparable to the knowledge of the constitution of the sun that has been gained of recent years by the study of it during the time of an eclipse. Consequently, expeditions have been sent out to the places where an expected eclipse could be best seen ; and the reports of different observers have been carefully compared, with the result that much has been discovered which the dazzling blaze of sunlight had previously concealed from us ; though now that we know exactly what to look for, we can recognise at other times some things which only the eclipse had made known to us. I have thought that in like manner the dazzling brightness of the divine element has obscured for us much of the human element ; and that now a study in which the divine element has been shut out may enable us to see many things more clearly, the knowledge of which will remain a permanent benefit, even after this method of investigation has been abandoned. And surely people who make eclipse observations on the sun must not be supposed to wish to live in this semi-darkness, or to think it better than the full glory of the unclouded rays.

I regret, however, that I have only taken up this study after I had become too old to prosecute it with much success. I have often noted of how little value an old

man's work commonly is. Old men are apt to see visions and to dream dreams. They devote the latest years of their life to studies which they imagine will outdo the best work of their earlier years, and will be recognised as having produced results of permanent value. Yet their survivors, if competent judges, sometimes adjudge the papers left behind as not deserving the honour of print; or if they have not courage to destroy what has evidently cost much labour, they find the general verdict of the literary public to be that the world would have lost nothing if a less merciful decision had been made. If I were asked to account for this general ill-success of old men's work, my own experience would lead me to impute it to failure of memory. I find myself now constantly reminded by some accident of having forgotten something which if I had been younger I should certainly have kept in mind. But, above all, I find inconvenience from not being able to keep the whole of a case thoroughly before my mind all together; and consequently while dealing, as I must, with separate points singly, being tempted to adopt conclusions and explanations which I should have rejected if able to take a larger view. It may be asked then, Why persevere at all in a study which I feel myself unable to prosecute satisfactorily? or why embarrass my executors by leaving papers behind which regard for my memory might restrain them from putting in the fire, though in their own judgment that might be the best thing to do with them? I have put this question to myself, and have not been able to give a satisfactory answer. As for my own continuance in the study, if it is no more than a solitary patience game, it is one which has a certain fascination for me, and is at least an innocent employment of hours which would not be better employed if spent otherwise. As for the preservation of my papers,

modern humanity does not impose on a parent the decision which a Roman father had to make, whether his offspring were worth preserving ; and at least it does not require him to be himself the executioner, if in tenderness of heart he prefers to expose the babe on the mountains, and leaves it to chance or to others to decide whether it is to live or to die.

INTRODUCTION

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

READERS of this book are not likely to need any lengthened preliminary explanation of the problem which it is its object to investigate.

We are in possession of four narratives of the life of our Lord, the great antiquity of which must be admitted even by those who reject the general belief that they are founded on the testimony of eye-witnesses of the facts related. If these narratives had been perfectly independent, we might expect them to differ from each other a good deal, both in the selection of incidents for narration, and in the arrangement of those related by more Evangelists than one. And so in point of fact one of these narratives does differ from the other three. But these three have so many points of agreement, not only in the selection and arrangement of incidents, but sometimes in the very words in which the story is told, that it is impossible to doubt the existence in these narratives of a common element, either to be accounted for by the supposition that one of these writers copied from another, or else that all drew from a common source. Still, if we compare places where the same story is told by more Evangelists than one, we constantly find such diversity as to shew that there has been no slavish copying; but that if there was a common original, a good deal of liberty must have been used in occasional deviations from it.

The problem is to find what account of the mutual relations of these narratives will best explain their

coincidences and their variations. The documents are older by at least a century than any records of the Christian Church which could tell us anything of the history of their publication. We are thus left to draw our conclusions from the internal evidence afforded by the documents themselves; and the difficulty of arriving in this way at secure results is proved by the discordant conclusions of the many critics who have examined this question. We may take this discordance as a warning, showing us the wisdom of postponing the adoption of any theory until we have first made a very patient study of the facts.

The problem of accounting for the agreements of the Evangelists naturally takes precedence of that of accounting for their variations. If the three narratives were independent of each other, diversity were to be expected; and the need of accounting for it does not arise as a literary problem, until we have found reason to believe that two writers draw from a common source. Even in the case of two biographers who have drawn their facts from the same original, absolute uniformity is not to be expected. Each of them is apt to prefer to tell the story in his own words, though no doubt he is likely to incorporate in his narrative many of the phrases of his original. And, if there is no reason to the contrary, each of them is also likely, in his arrangement of the facts, to follow the order of the original. Still it is possible that either may designedly deviate from that order; whether with the view of placing the facts in what is supposed to be the true chronological order, or with the artistic purpose of grouping incidents of the same kind together. If the two later writers have more common sources than one, in which the order of narration may possibly have been different, they may have combined them in different ways. And besides, there is nothing to surprise us, if in the procedure of independent writers we find variations for which we cannot precisely account. Thus then the need of accounting for diversities does not arise until we have

first established the existence of such an original connexion between the narrators as would lead us to expect to find agreement to be the rule.

I have said elsewhere (*Introd. N.T.*, p. 571) that we are not warranted in founding an investigation of the Gospel history on an assumption that those who recorded it used their materials in a different way from what other historical writers of the same age were likely to do. In so saying, I did not merely mean to deprecate the founding of our investigation on any theory of inspiration adopted previously to a patient study of the facts; but I had equally in view the exclusion of quite an opposite theory, which has been acted on by one who holds the very lowest view of the inspiration of the Evangelists, Dr Edwin Abbott. He tacitly assumes that a writer who derives his information from another, would not venture to deviate in the slightest degree from the very words in which the information had been conveyed. Consequently, though he acknowledges the existence of a common element in the Gospels, he only recognises as belonging to that common element those places where the same story is told in identical words. The result of eliminating all words which are not common to all the Evangelists is often to make the narrative unintelligible without the help of one of the existing Gospels to throw light on it. Time would be wasted in formal argument against a supposition so completely destitute of support from our experience of the ways of writers who use the words of others. Certainly, if a writer had to refute a charge of plagiarism, he would plead in vain, if he could only point out to his critic that he had proved his originality by frequently using expressions different from those to be found in the author from whom he was accused of having borrowed.

In fact it is easy to see that though verbal coincidences may be used to prove the indebtedness of one writer to another, yet verbal variations do not disprove it. If two writers telling the same story agree in the use of

the same words or phrases, the question at once arises whether the later has not borrowed from the earlier. It is a not uncommon error to found a charge of plagiarism on the common use of phrases which belong to the ordinary vocabulary of the time, and which the two writers might very conceivably have employed independently. But if the phrases are strange and unusual, then we cannot help believing that one borrowed from the other, unless what is common to them can be traced to a source from which both might have derived it. On the other hand, if there is substantial agreement—if the later writer has nothing to tell which he might not have learnt from the other, then there arises a suspicion of indebtedness, which is not refuted by any variations of language through which the obligation has been disguised.

I can quite understand how critics who hold a very high theory of verbal inspiration are much embarrassed by variations even in the language, when the same circumstances are recorded by more Evangelists than one; and still more if the discrepancies are more than verbal. Their whole theory collapses unless some way can be found of reconciling these differences; either, for instance, by maintaining that the two discordant accounts are not narratives of the same event, or else that one of them was not intended to have the meaning which an ordinary reader would put upon it. But considering how common it is to find differences in details between the accounts of two honest witnesses of the same occurrence, it is surprising that persons who are not hampered by any extreme theory of inspiration should be distressed by differences between the accounts of two sacred writers. It may even happen that they are such that the reception of the one account as strictly accurate would force us to the conclusion that the writer of the other had received some defective or erroneous information. Yet the only differences that would affect our belief in the main facts of the Gospel story would be if they were such as to make it difficult

to believe that the writers had access to first hand information about the facts, or that they did not faithfully record the information they received.

I will add besides, that though a single mistake would be enough to disprove the claim that knowledge had been supernaturally communicated, yet that, as far as human information is concerned, a person may be a high authority on some matters concerning which he had exceptionally good means of information, notwithstanding his having committed errors on other points concerning which he had smaller opportunities of knowledge. To take an illustration from a well-known book, Napier's *History of the Peninsular War*—This is a book of real historical value, on account of the author's exceptional opportunities of knowledge concerning the facts which he relates, but the author is not entitled to the same deference on subjects outside his own sphere; nor ought his statements on his own subject to be at all discredited, even if it could be shewn that he was not equally trustworthy in his account of events twenty years before his own time.

For myself, I have no confidence in any historical investigation in which a perfectly open mind is not kept with regard to the reception of new information. Those who held the theories of inspiration to which I have already referred were not embarrassed for a moment if there appeared to be a contradiction between the statements of a sacred and of a profane writer. That of the former was infallibly right, and the other was held entitled to no regard. Through a natural reaction, a modern school of critics completely reversed this decision. A statement of Scripture was held to be certainly false if it was contradicted by any profane writer, and very probably false if it was not confirmed by independent testimony, however scanty the historical records of the time might be. Much new light has been cast upon history by the discoveries of the present century, during which many important manuscripts have been unearthed, inscriptions have been extensively

collected and studied, and other archæological evidence obtained ; and we have every reason to believe that the coming years will continue to add to the materials for history that we at present possess. Yet I have no apprehension that we shall be obliged to discard, as unworthy of confidence, the historical guides in whom we have hitherto trusted. It is extravagance of claims which is likely to produce a sceptical attitude of mind : if, for instance, the principle is laid down that a writer who is detected in a single error forfeits all claim to be regarded as a historical authority. The fact, however, is that there is no one who does not make mistakes ; and that occasionally a very good writer will make a very bad one.

I will add, that in forming a judgment on the merits of a historian it is fair that he should be tried by the standard of his own age. A couple of hundred years ago a historian was thought to have acquitted himself well if he composed a lucid narrative in a pleasing style ; and it is not reasonable to censure one who wrote then, if he did not use the diligence in collecting materials that is now thought necessary, or if he did not take great pains in balancing the credibility of each of his witnesses. But it seems to me that it is the opposite fault that is now most frequently committed in the criticism of the Gospels ; in other words, that the amount of literary skill to be fairly expected from the writer is apt to be, not over-rated, but under-rated. For example, when both Alford and Abbott assume, as a thing to be expected, that an Evangelist who used an earlier document should simply embody it in his work *verbatim*, they practically treat the Gospel historian as likely to possess no more literary skill than a monastic annalist, who was often content to copy the entries of his predecessors, merely adding, in equally inartificial style, some notices of events that occurred between their time and his own. But our Evangelists lived in a literary age ; and while it would not be reasonable to expect that every one of them should exhibit in his style the highest accomplishments of a practised writer,

it would be equally unreasonable to assume that they were ignorant as to what the reading public of their day had been trained to expect, or that they made no attempt to satisfy those expectations. If we want information as to the literary standard of the time, we can get it from Polybius, who wrote some two hundred years before our Evangelists; and the principles which he lays down as to the duties of a historian do not substantially differ from those that are accepted in our own day. It was to me an unexpected touch of modernness that having occasion to criticise severely the work of Zeno, a Rhodian historian, Polybius tells us (*Hist.*, xvi. 20) that, counting it unbecoming to triumph in exposing the blunders of another, he wrote a private letter to Zeno pointing out an error into which he had fallen; and that Zeno took the correction very kindly, but was sorry that it was now too late for him to profit by it, his book having been already published.

Believing that it is quite as important to take note of substantial as of verbal agreements, I make no use at this stage of our enquiries of a work prepared at Dr E. Abbott's suggestion—Mr Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*. In this work, by the use of different types and differently coloured inks, the reader is enabled to compare parallel evangelic narratives, and to see at a glance what words are common to three Evangelists, what to only two, and what are peculiar to one. We may neglect differences which disappear on translation, when we are only examining whether two writers who tell the same story drew from independent sources of information. At a later stage, if interdependence has been established, a careful examination of the language will be needful for guiding us to more exact conclusions as to the relations between the writers; as, for example, in determining the question whether one copied another, or both drew from a common source.¹

¹ My own experience would lead me to recommend a student to copy out for himself the parallel stories which he desires to compare. In this way he will be struck by the recurrence of identical words more forcibly than by any help diversity of types could give him.

There is another preliminary investigation, which, as dealing with the matter rather than the words of the narrators, can be effectively carried on, even though only a translation is used: I mean the study of the order in which the different stories are related. It is only a study of the order in which incidents are told that gives probability to the hypothesis that an Evangelist used a previous document. Any agreement between two in the relation of a single story would be sufficiently explained by the supposition that both had heard it told by the same Apostle, and had been able to reproduce, with more or less exactness, his very words. But, besides numberless instances of identity in the form in which separate stories are related, we find a multitude of cases in which a whole series of incidents follow in the same order in more Gospels than one. The stories rarely contain any notes of time which could direct the order of placing them; and, if they had been preserved separately by oral tradition, the chances are enormous that different persons weaving them into a connected narrative would arrange them differently. It follows that if one Evangelist did not make use of the work of another, all must have derived from a common source, not only their common matter, but also the arrangement in which they agree. If it be not admitted that they used any written document, it would have to be acknowledged that the apostolic record, which they have preserved, did not consist of anecdotes told separately, and casually remembered, but that the original narrator must have related incidents in a definite order, so as, in fact, to have delivered an oral Gospel.

I am willing to use the word *document* in so elastic a sense as to include an oral Gospel faithfully preserved in the memory of those who had listened to it; but the hypothesis of such a Gospel is not forced on us, because we know from St Luke's preface that other written accounts of our Saviour's life were in existence before our Third Gospel was published. (See *Introd. N. T.*, p. 572 *sqq.*)

My object in the present investigation is to ascertain what conclusions as to the genesis of the Gospels can be drawn from a study of the documents themselves, without the assumption of the truth or falsity of any traditional accounts. Such accounts as have reached us are but scanty ; and few of them can be traced back to a date so early as to give us assurance that those to whom we owe them were speaking, not from conjecture, but from real historical knowledge. But with whatever caution these traditions must be used, they give us important help in our study of the documents. They suggest to us hypotheses which must be tested, questions that must be asked, and, as Lord Bacon has said, *Prudens interrogatio dimidium est scientiæ*.

Let us take, for example, the tradition reported by Papias that St Mark had been in personal intercourse with the Apostle Peter, some of the reporters of which have so magnified the Evangelist's obligations to that Apostle, that, according to their view, the Second Gospel ought rather to have been designated as the Gospel according to St Peter, than as that according to St Mark. The fact that such a tradition existed presents us with a problem to be investigated in our study of the Second Gospel—namely, whether it exhibits traces of such an authority as has been claimed for it. Speaking for myself, I may say that I have found no reason to believe in anything that later writers have added to what Papias had stated ; and that I do not believe that St Peter had any share in the composition of St Mark's Gospel, or that he was in any way responsible for its contents. But I consider that critical study would lead us to believe that some of the Evangelist's statements were derived directly or indirectly from that Apostle ; and therefore I would not hastily reject a tradition that there had been personal intercourse between the two.

What inclines me most to accept the statement of Papias, is the marked difference of style between the section of the Gospel which relates what happened before

the calling of Peter and those which tell of what happened after it—the contrast between the meagreness of St Mark's narrative in the one case, and its fulness in the other. In the earlier history, as told by St Matthew and by St Luke, we find a common element which could not have been derived from Mark, who tells the same story, with so much greater brevity, that the first question we are disposed to submit to critical investigation is whether St Mark's is more than an abridgment of an earlier narrative. But when we go on to compare the remainder of St Mark's first chapter with the corresponding passage of Matthew, we find the parts quite reversed: it is now St Matthew who is the abridger, St Mark who tells the full story. All the rest of that chapter is occupied with the relation of the events that occurred on a single day of the Saviour's life; and that day was the Sabbath that followed the calling of Peter. The history includes the account of a visit paid by our Lord to Peter's house; if indeed we are not rather to conclude that our Lord was lodging in that house at the time. The change then from an abridged to a detailed narrative takes place exactly when Peter comes into the story; and thus internal evidence harmonises with the very ancient tradition that the Evangelist had had personal intercourse with St Peter.

I hope that my readers will not consider that I am committing them to the acceptance of what, however probable, is no more than a hypothesis, if I use the letter P to denote the authority used by the Evangelists in passages which all three Synoptics have in common. I am not assuming that P is identical with St Mark's Gospel as we have it now. Theories about an *Original Matthew*, an *Original Mark*, from which the Gospels now bearing these names have been developed, have had much circulation. We should not be justified at the outset of a scientific enquiry in assuming either the truth or the falsity of such theories. When, in what follows, I speak of St Matthew and St Mark, I am to be understood to mean the authors of the First and

Second Gospels as we have them now, without assuming anything as to the identity of the traditional and the real authorship ; while I postpone for further enquiry the question whether the Matthew and Mark that we have now may not have had predecessors ascribed to the same authors.

I have already said that in the sections common to three Evangelists, St Mark frequently gives details absent from the other two Synoptics ; and the question which a critic has to decide is whether these additional particulars are sufficiently accounted for by the hypothesis that St Mark, having a pictorial turn of mind, added these details from his own sense of the fitness of things. I must not here anticipate discussions which will come more suitably afterwards ; but I can now state the result at which I have arrived—namely, that there are some cases in which St Mark's fulness of detail is best explained, not by the hypothesis that this Evangelist had greater powers of graphic description, but that he had access to more accurate information. If this be so, I see no reason for rejecting the tradition that St Peter may have been the source of that information. If St Mark was not in these sections an expander of Matthew, St Matthew must have been an abridger ; but the question remains open for critical enquiry whether it was St Mark's Gospel that St Matthew abridged, or whether the First Gospel represents to us a document which, being earlier than the Second, does not contain St Mark's characteristic touches.

We are bound to take the second supposition into account, because we have already seen that the hypothesis that the other two Synoptics used St Mark's Gospel will not explain all the phenomena. The account of the Baptist's preaching and of our Lord's baptism as given by St Matthew and St Luke have clearly some common elements which seem to indicate the use of a common authority ; and that authority could not be St Mark, in whose Gospel the common elements of which I am here speaking are not found. I find it

convenient then, if I use the letter P to denote the common authority used in the sections which all three Synoptics have in common, to use the letter Q to denote the common authority of the sections common to Matthew and Luke. This notation binds us to nothing. It may be that we shall find on examination that P and Q are the same, that is to say, that we have no need to postulate more than one common authority used by the Evangelists; and that Q means no more than those parts of P which St Mark has abridged or used more slightly. But if we used the same symbol to denote the authority for what I call the P sections and the Q sections, we should seem to lend ourselves to the theory that there was but a single authority for both classes of passages. It remains, however, open to investigation whether St Mark was not acquainted with Q; and the result at which I have myself arrived is that he was.

There are some who have thought that we must come nearer to the truth the more we simplify our hypothesis: as, for instance, if we hold that St Matthew and St Luke made use of Mark, thus reducing our fundamental documents to one. But there is no good reason for so thinking. St Luke tells us, in his preface, that *many* before him had attempted to make an orderly narrative of our Lord's life. There were therefore many *Gospels* which St Luke had read, and of which he might have made such use as his independent knowledge showed that they deserved. If we have reason to think that St Mark's Gospel was one of them, we are not entitled to assume without proof that it was the only one. Neither are we entitled to assume without proof that, for instance, the things common to Matthew and Luke were all derived from a single document; and my notation is not intended to convey that idea, for we are at liberty, if we find good reason, to split it up into Q₁, Q₂, etc.

I have preferred to speak of *sources* rather than of *documents* to which our Evangelists might have been

indebted, because the latter may seem to denote written as opposed to oral sources of information ; and I do not myself attach importance to the question which were used. The whole Gospel history no doubt ultimately rests on the oral statements of the first disciples ; but I do not see that any questions concerning the inspiration of our records are much affected, whether the Apostles' statements were at once committed to writing, or were preserved by faithful memories. But I have contended that the agreement between the Evangelists in their order of narration proves that their common source was not a mere collection of anecdotes arbitrarily put together, but had already assumed the form of a continuous narrative. Yet I willingly admit the probability that such continuous narratives had been orally promulgated among Christians before the circulation of any written Gospel.

It seems to me, then, that we may easily make mistakes in our criticism of the Gospels, if we assume that the methods of the writers may fitly be judged by what we know of the present practice of literary men, who piece documents together in order to write a history. It may be that the first Gospels were composed, not in order to be read, but to be spoken. Shakespeare's plays, for example, were not composed in order to be circulated as literature among a reading public, but were put into writing for the use of the actors who were to deliver them orally ; and it is to actors that we owe the preservation of the plays.

St Luke's preface to his Gospel illustrates the fact that however little reason we have to think that the Gospels were first composed to satisfy the demands of a reading public, yet such demands would begin to arise as soon as the religion was embraced by men of culture and education. In the same preface St Luke, who does not profess ability to speak from his own personal knowledge of the facts, describes the sources of his information : *even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers*

of the word. What, I think, most persons are apt to understand by this is, that St Luke, though not an apostle, or an eye-witness of the events of our Lord's life, had made the acquaintance of some of those who were, and had learnt (in private intercourse with them) the things which he afterwards recorded for the benefit of the Church. But I am now more disposed to believe that St Luke owed his knowledge of our Saviour's history, not to any private communication, but to the public instruction given in the Church of the city to which he belonged.

I have seen no reason for rejecting the common belief that the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts was a fellow-traveller with St Paul. But we have no reason to believe that St Paul had ever been a hearer of our Lord; and it is probable that with regard to the history of our Lord's life on earth, St Luke had more to teach St Paul than to learn from him. It is possible that in his later years St Luke may have made the acquaintance of some of the heads of the Jerusalem Church; but it would be rash to affirm that he did, or that the acquaintance was very intimate. What I regard as the source of St Luke's knowledge is the public recital of the history in the Church of Antioch, of which all the evidence leads me to regard him as a member. It seems to have been the earliest formed Church outside the Holy Land, and was certainly the most important of those early Churches. The date of its formation must have been very early; for we are told that it was founded by some of those who were dispersed from Jerusalem by the persecution which arose on Stephen's death; but at that time those who had been guilty of our Lord's death were still in power (Acts vii. 52). Those who founded the Church of Antioch in all probability included some who had been personal disciples of our Lord; and in any case this important Church must have received many visits from leading members of the parent Church, of whom we can actually mention by

name as visiting Antioch, Barnabas, John Mark, Judas, possibly Silas, and the Apostle Peter. The version of the Gospel history weekly recited in such a Church must be regarded as an authority of great weight. I do not suppose that in St Luke's Gospel we have this version exactly; since it is natural to suppose that when the Evangelist committed his narrative to writing he might combine materials which had reached him from other sources, but that this version formed the groundwork of his narrative is a reasonable supposition.

The most probable explanation of the fact that we have now three histories of our Lord's life, so like one another, yet in many parts so independent, is that we have preserved for us the oral Gospel as delivered at three different centres. And that these three versions should have so many points of agreement, both in the arrangement of topics, and frequently in the very phrases employed, justifies the belief that the common element of our three Synoptics was not a mere cento of sayings of Jesus, or of anecdotes of His actions, but an oral Gospel which gave a continuous history of His life, from His baptism by John to His crucifixion.

We must not, however, pass over in silence an important question. In what language are we to suppose this oral Gospel to have been first delivered? In connexion with this we must consider a tradition of Papias preserved by Eusebius (*E. H.*, iii. 39). He says concerning St Matthew's Gospel, *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἑρμηνεύσε δ' αὐτὰ, ὡς ἦν δυνατός, ἕκαστος.* The last clause is clearly not applicable to the private reading of a book. It clearly intimates that there was no authorised translation of St Matthew's Gospel. In that case no one who did not understand the language would attempt to read it; and if he did understand it, he would not need an interpreter. It seems to me plain that what Papias has in his mind is the public Church use of the Gospel. It had been the custom in the Jewish synagogues, even where Hebrew had ceased to be a spoken language, to

read the Hebrew Scriptures, but to have the reading followed by an interpretation ; and we find traces for two or three centuries of a similar custom in the mixed congregations of the Christian Church.¹ I make no doubt, then, that what Papias gives us to understand is that the Aramaic Gospel of St Matthew was for some time read in the Christian Church, that no authorised translation of it into Greek was published, but that on each occasion the official charged by the Church with this duty gave an interpretation according to his ability. It is quite intelligible that the method of interpretation which was used in making public the written memoirs of St Matthew would be used also with regard to the oral addresses of other Apostles whose native language was Aramaic, and who either from necessity or from choice made their public addresses rather in that tongue than in one with which they were less familiar ; nor need we be at any loss to understand what is meant when Mark or Glaucias is described as having been the *interpreter* of St Peter.

What has been said as to the probable use of Aramaic by the original witnesses of the Gospel history, suggests a method of reconciling variations between the existing records which has been often attempted. Some differences between our Greek Gospels would at once disappear on translating back into Aramaic, and a few more could be reconciled by tempting conjectures. Of course, in our study of the Gospels, we must not lose sight of the possibility which I have indicated. But it must be owned that

¹ Towards the end of the fourth century, we find the method of bilingual instruction still in use in Palestine, but with this difference, that Greek is now the language spoken by the bishop, and the interpretation is for the benefit of those who do not speak that language. (*S. Sylvie Peregrinatio* referred to by Zahn, *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, i., p. 43.) “Et quoniam in ea provincia pars populi et græce et siriste novit, pars etiam alia per se græce, aliqua etiam pars tantum siriste, itaque, quoniam episcopus, licet siriste noverit, tamen semper græce loquitur, et nunquam siriste ; itaque ergo stat semper presbyter, qui episcopo græce dicente, siriste interpretatur ut omnes audiant que exponuntur. Lectiones etiam, quæcunque in ecclesia leguntur, quia necesse est græce legi, semper stat qui siriste interpretatur, propter populum ut semper discant.” (*Itinera Hierosolymitana* ed. P. Geyer, p. 99.)

very few results of this kind have been obtained which we can adopt with entire confidence; and the explanation seems to be that the Gospel history had passed out of the Aramaic into a definite Greek form before any of the existing Greek Gospels had been written.

Before I part with this statement of Papias that Matthew wrote τὰ λόγια in Hebrew, it is proper to mention an inference which Schleiermacher drew from it, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which has been fortunate enough to find more acceptance than in my opinion is deserved. He understood by τὰ λόγια a collection of our Lord's sayings, and imagined that such was the nature of the earliest Gospel. Of late years this idea has been very widely adopted. When, not long since, an Egyptian papyrus was discovered, in which many supposed utterances of our Lord were recorded, with the introduction *Jesus saith*, the leaves were generally described as taken from a collection of *Logia*, and any saying of our Lord is commonly spoken of as a *Logion*. But for this use of the word I find no authority earlier than the nineteenth century; and now it rests solely on a doubtful interpretation of an ambiguous word in an isolated extract from a lost book. Yet if Papias had intended τὰ λόγια as the title of St Matthew's Gospel, he would not have entitled his own work *Δογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις*, since it does not appear to have been either a commentary on St Matthew's Gospel, or to have been confined to an exposition of sayings of our Lord. It would be strange if some of those early writers who mention Papias had not followed his use of this word. We shall find as we go along that the very earliest forms of the Gospel which we can trace were all like the Gospels we have now, dealing with the things that Jesus did, as well as those which He said. And, above all, if there had been any early Gospel treating exclusively of our Lord's sayings, we should find traces of the order of that book in the

arrangement of those sayings by subsequent writers. But, in point of fact, it is especially with regard to the sayings of our Lord that we find so much variety of arrangement as to preclude the idea that all drew from a common source, whose order we might expect would be followed by all.

I purpose now to go systematically through the portion of the Gospel history which has been preserved by more Evangelists than one, endeavouring in each case to form the best judgment that I can as to the source whence the narrative is most probably derived. And I may state once for all that I am duly sensible of the reserve with which the conclusions we draw in any particular case must be asserted. Even in that one case opinions may differ; for it constantly happens that what one takes as a note of priority is regarded by another as a proof of obligation. And the conclusions suggested by a few instances, or by one, are liable to be modified when we find them overbalanced on the result of a larger induction.

It will be observed that I am not concerned with textual criticism or with exegesis, except when they seem to throw light on the special subject of our enquiry. Nor, as a general rule, do I purpose to comment on passages peculiar to a single Evangelist; because any assertion as to the source whence he obtained his knowledge must rest mainly on conjecture.

I make an exception, however, as regards the sections peculiar to Mark. These are so very few that the commentary on the passages common to St Mark and another Evangelist would go so very near being a commentary on the whole of his Gospel that it does not seem worth while to omit the few exceptional cases where Mark stands alone.

But I need not defer stating the opinion, to which my whole study of the Synoptic Gospels has led me, of the superior value of St Mark's Gospel. I have already expressed my acceptance of two traditions

preserved by Papias, viz., that St Matthew had been the author of an Aramaic Gospel, and that St Mark had been on terms of special intimacy with St Peter. But I must express my entire dissent from what perhaps is not so much a tradition recorded by Papias, as a critical judgment of his; viz., that, as regards the order of the things related, St Mark's authority is lower than that of the other two Synoptics. Papias had evidently to deal with the difficulty that in some particular cases St Mark's order of narration differs from that of the other Evangelists; and his solution is that St Mark does not aim at presenting to us the order in which the different incidents occurred, but only the order in which St Peter had related them, or at least the order in which the things told by the Apostle occurred to the Evangelist's memory. I believe that a critical examination leads to precisely the opposite conclusion. I consider that St Matthew's Gospel, or St Luke's, might be adequately described as a cento of our Lord's sayings and of the leading incidents of His life, such as those who had personally known Him might have told after His death to their disciples. Both Gospels assume Jesus to be well known as a great teacher who had enlisted a body of admiring disciples, but who was confronted by prejudiced and influential opponents; but it is St Mark's Gospel that must be consulted by any one who desires to know whether there was anything gradual in the process by which the attachment of His followers was gained, and the opposition of His adversaries excited. And I can well believe that St Mark has preserved for us in some cases a trustworthy report, obtained from an eye-witness, of the details of incidents told in a general way by St Matthew.

I have already expressed my opinion that the prologue of St Mark, by which I mean the first thirteen verses of his Gospel, exhibits signs of a different style of treatment from the following sections,

and that in short it shows tokens of a pre-Petrine source. I think it right, therefore, to deal with this section separately, any conclusions that we draw from it being not necessarily applicable to the following sections.

THE PROLOGUE OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL

I have already sufficiently explained why I consider that the study of the first thirteen verses of Mark ought to be separated from that of the rest of the Gospel; any conclusions that we may arrive at as to the composition of the former not being necessarily applicable to the latter. In much of the rest of the Gospel St Mark deserves to be regarded as a primary authority, independent of the other two Synoptics, and equally deserving of consideration. In this which I have called his prologue, he is not only not an original authority, but we have some means of knowing the source which he employed; and thus of forming a judgment on the manner in which he has dealt with it. The verbal coincidences between the accounts given by St Matthew and by St Luke, both of the Baptist's teaching and of our Lord's temptation in the wilderness, leave no room for doubt that these two Evangelists have used a common authority, which I here provisionally call Q. The corresponding parts of St Mark's Gospel read like an abridgment of Q, some of the phrases of which are retained; so that, as to the sources of this prologue, our enquiry reduces itself to the two points, Was St Mark acquainted with Q? and, Did he use any other authority?

MARK i. 1. Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ Θεοῦ.

This opening verse of Mark, having no parallel in either of the other Gospels, supplies no materials for what is the special object of the present study—speculation as to the sources used by the Evangelist. In fact

I see no reason for imagining that St Mark was indebted to any one for what I look on as the title which he prefixed to his work. For such an opening the Evangelist had an Old Testament precedent; for the Book of the Twelve Prophets commences, *The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea*, Ἀρχὴ λόγου Κυρίου ἐν Ὠσηε (Hos. i. 2).

In considering this title in detail I find it convenient to study the words in their inverse order; and I begin with the last two words *υἱοῦ θεοῦ*, because they have been cancelled by Tischendorf, and consigned to the margin by Hort. Yet I cannot feel any doubt that they are a genuine part of the Evangelist's text. I have already said that the criticism of the text does not come directly within the scope of my enquiries; but as the verse now under consideration is in a special sense the Evangelist's own, any error in the transmission of it would affect all our inferences from it as to the date of the Gospel and the person of the writer. Now considering in the first place the external evidence, the favourable testimony of the Greek MSS. is overwhelming. The only exception worth mentioning is that the first hand of the Sinaitic MS. leaves them out, though the omission appears to have received contemporary correction. Tischendorf's decision seems in this, as in some other cases, to have been biassed by partiality for the manuscript which he had himself made known to the world. Against the doubtful possibility that the first transcriber of \aleph had not found these words in his archetype must be set the recognition of the words, not only by the whole body of Greek MSS., with two trivial exceptions (28, 255), but in particular by the Vatican MS. Although I have not been able to agree with Hort in his ordinary treatment of this MS., as if it were practically infallible, I feel the greatest reverence for it, as having preserved for us a type of text older than that made known to us by any other authority, and it is therefore with the greatest reluctance that I ever reject its testimony; and in the few cases where Hort does so, he seems to me

to set aside evidence merely in obedience to a critical canon of his own.

Hort is not content to acknowledge in a general way the laxity of the members of the infant Church. His hypothesis is that, while it must be owned that they were little simpletons as to the addition of unauthentic matter, it is incredible that they would omit anything that had any kind of claim to have inspired authority. Consequently, if there be evidence that there were once current two forms of an Evangelic story, he feels little hesitation in always deciding that the shorter must certainly be the older, and is to be accounted the genuine one. But I cannot ascribe such authority to any *à priori* principle of criticism as would entitle it to make us accept the testimony of less credible witnesses, rejecting that of those whom we have good reason to regard as their superiors. Of course in our decision we have always to consider the two questions, If the shorter form be the genuine, how came the doubtful passage to be inserted? In the opposite case, How are we to account for its omission? But it does not necessarily follow that if we cannot answer the second question satisfactorily, we may make our decision without ever putting to ourselves the first.

In the present case omission is not difficult to explain. The most important evidence against the genuineness of the words consists in the verse having been quoted by some early writers without the two concluding words ; but in none of these cases does it appear to me that these words are relevant to the purpose for which Mark is quoted. It is common enough to find writers abridging a quotation by the omission of words of which they make no use in their argument. Thus Irenæus quotes the present passage in full where he builds an argument on the words *Son of God* (*Hær. Int.* iii. 10, 6, p. 187 ; 16, 3, p. 205), but elsewhere, where he does not, he omits them. The present passage has also been quoted (*Iren. Hær. Int.* iii. 11, 8, p. 191 ; *Epiph. Hær.* li. 6) with the omission, not only of the words

Son of God, but also of *Jesus Christ*, the genuineness of which is undisputed. (The Greek of Iren., p. 191, has *Jesus Christ*.) It may perhaps be remarked, too, that a verse which only dates from the time when St Mark put the oral Gospel into a literary form was more liable to depravation in quotation than any portion of the original record which had been made familiar by continual repetition.

On the whole then it seems to me that it is opposed to all sound criticism to cancel words that are almost unanimously attested by our most trustworthy authorities and which are in complete accordance with the habitual use of the writer to whom they are attributed, merely on the strength of an *à priori* assumption that if it can be shown that two forms of text were ever current in early times, the shorter, however poorly attested, must certainly be the original.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—The combination *Jesus Christ* is found here only in St Mark's Gospel. Elsewhere in this Gospel the word *Christ* is used only in its original sense, as the name of an office, the equivalent of *Messiah*, which, as being conceivably applicable to more persons than one, could not be used as a personal name. It was only when the sole Messiahship of Jesus came to be felt to be altogether beyond question that those who acknowledged it compressed the official description *Jesus the Messiah* into the personal name *Jesus Christ*. And so it became a matter of indifference, as it still is with ourselves, whether, in speaking of our Lord, we call Him *Jesus* or *Christ*. But this usage had become established before the earliest date to which we can assign St Mark's Gospel. It is enough to give the statistics for the Epistle to the Romans, which do not materially differ from what might be gathered from the other Pauline Epistles. St Paul in that Epistle, when speaking of our Lord, calls Him *Jesus Christ* twenty-one times; *Christ Jesus* ten times; *Christ* thirty-three times. In the vast majority of these instances, and probably in

all, *Christ* is used only as a personal name ; for there are extremely few in which the sense will allow us to translate *χριστός*, *the Messiah* ; I do not delay to notice those where He is called *Jesus*, or *the Lord*, or is described as *God's Son*. The reason why St Mark in his Gospel habitually speaks of our Lord as *Jesus*, and never as *Christ*, is clearly dictated by a sense of chronological propriety. St Mark, for example, is careful not to use the name *Peter* until he has related in his third chapter that our Lord gave the Apostle that name ; when he is spoken of previously he is always called *Simon*.

Εὐαγγελίου.—The word *gospel* is of course not to be understood here in the sense which it afterwards acquired, viz., as a narrative of the Saviour's life and teaching. But it would be equally erroneous to translate it merely as *good tidings* ; for the word early acquired a technical sense, though a wider one, viz., as appropriated to that divine message of good tidings, which Jesus Christ came to announce, and which His Church was commissioned to preach. Thus ultimately *The gospel* became a phrase which could be used without further explanation, and might denote the whole of the Christian dispensation. This use had been already established when St Paul wrote. It will suffice to give one example, out of several, where he speaks of *the gospel* : ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν (1 Cor. ix. 14). The same use is continued by St Mark (i. 15 ; viii. 35 ; x. 29 ; xiii. 10) ; and, taken in connexion with what has already been said, may be taken as an additional proof that the title of Mark is penetrated by Pauline language.

The indebtedness of St Mark to St Paul may be more confidently asserted when it is observed that neither St Matthew nor St Luke uses the same phraseology. The phrase *The gospel* is never used in the First Gospel, without some words to limit the application of the general term. There *The gospel of the*

38 PROLOGUE OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL

kingdom occurs iv. 23; ix. 35; xxiv. 14; and is continued by St Mark, i. 14 (*T. R.*, see p. 82). St Matthew also uses the phrase *The sons of the kingdom*, viii. 12; xiii. 38. It is to be noted that St Luke, who appears to have studied correctness of language, never in his Gospel uses the noun *εὐαγγέλιον*, though he frequently uses the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι*, which has Septuagint authority, as for instance in the well-known texts of Isaiah: 'Ανάβηθι, ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Σειῶν (xl. 9); 'Ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης (lii. 7). If it be supposed that St Luke, as being also a companion of St Paul, was as likely as St Mark to have adopted Pauline usage, I have to express my belief that St Luke was an older man than St Mark, and had learnt the Gospel history in Antioch before he ever became a companion of St Paul. In his later work, the Acts, he introduces the noun (xv. 7; xx. 24).

'Αρχή.—Taking, as I do, *εὐαγγέλιον* to mean the Gospel dispensation, I gather from St Mark's title that the Evangelist counted that dispensation to commence with the baptism of John. And though St Matthew and St Luke both go back in their narrative to the conception and birth of our Lord, yet I infer from the great variation between St Matthew and St Luke in the pre-Johannine part of the history that their common authority did not. And it does not seem to me that St Luke dissented from St Mark's way of reckoning the preaching of the Baptist as the beginning of the Gospel; for in his preface he claims to have derived his information from persons who ἀπ' ἀρχῆς had been *eye-witnesses of the word*; a description which applies to those who had been disciples of John the Baptist, but cannot be referred back to any earlier date. In harmony with this, St Luke relates (Acts i. 22) that those were to be regarded as original disciples, from whom the successor of Judas was to be chosen, whose companionship with our Lord had dated from the baptism of John.

A modern reader might easily overlook the import-

ance attached by the first disciples to the announcement by the Baptist of a mightier than he who was to come after him. All the Synoptics relate that when Jesus called on Peter and Andrew, James and John to follow Him, they at once obeyed the summons; and if we had no other information we should suppose that this prompt obedience was due to a miraculous disposal of their hearts. But the Fourth Evangelist relates that the Baptist had previously pointed out Jesus to his disciples as the mightier successor whose coming he had predicted, and that it was in consequence of this indication that Jesus was joined by two of John's disciples, who at once proceeded to gather others to Him. Twice elsewhere (iii. 26; v. 33) the same Evangelist refers to the Baptist's testimony. All the Synoptic Gospels relate that when our Lord was challenged to state the grounds of the authority which He assumed, He silenced the questioners by asking them whether they recognised the Divine mission of the Baptist; the assumption involved in this question, viz., that if they believed John they must also believe Jesus, having plain reference to the testimony of the Baptist. The same testimony was appealed to by St Paul in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 25). See also Acts i. 5; xi. 16. In the Clementines far greater prominence is given to the influence of the Baptist than could be natural to a writer of the present day. In fact these Homilies represent Jesus as not only John's successor, but as having been for some time his leading and favourite disciple. Nor does the Gospel history enable us confidently to contradict this representation; for it would be pressing too far St Mark's use of his favourite adverb *εὐθὺς* in i. 12, which is not repeated in the corresponding passages of St Matthew or St Luke, if we were to conclude from it that there was no interval between our Lord's baptism and His being driven by the Spirit into the wilderness. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* iii. 6) infers from the saying *All the prophets and the law prophesied until John* (Matt. xi. 13), that John was the

connecting link between the two Dispensations, the end of the Prophets and the beginning of the Gospel. Thus we can see good reason why St Mark should count the Baptist's preaching as the beginning of the Gospel.

THE APPEARANCE OF THE BAPTIST

MARK i. 2-4.

Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ, “Ἰδοὺ, ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου.” “Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.” Ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

MATT. iii. 1-3.

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεταῖς παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας λέγων, Μετανοεῖτε, ἦγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεῖα τῶν οὐρανῶν. Οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, “Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.”

LUKE iii. 2-4.

Ἐγένετο ῥῆμα Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννῃ τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου, “Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.”

MATT. xi. 10 = LUKE vii. 27.

Οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, “Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.”

St Luke om. ἐγὼ bef. ἀποστέλλω.

In these opening verses of St Mark's Gospel we have the occurrence which I have already mentioned as unique, of agreement in respect of order of narration between St Matthew and St Luke against St Mark. The two former have so many points of verbal agreement in this part of their narrative that we cannot doubt that they drew from a common source which I have called Q; and it may be presumed that the order in which these two copyists agree is that of their common original.

The point of difference is that St Matthew and St Luke first relate that John came preaching *in the wilderness*, and then observe that this was a fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy, *The voice of one crying in the wilderness*; but St Mark makes no mention of John until he has first quoted the prophecy, the relevance

of which to what has gone before is not obvious; St Mark's intention apparently being to justify his phrase *the beginning*, by the proof from prophecy that the beginning of the New Dispensation was to be the appearance of the messenger who was to prepare the way for the coming Messiah.

The question then suggests itself for examination, Was Q used by St Mark, as well as by St Matthew and St Luke? In favour of the affirmative answer is the verbal agreement between St Mark and Q, not only in the verse now under consideration, but in other verses in the section concerning the Baptist. If we hold that St Matthew used Q, we cannot reasonably deny that St Mark drew from Q his description of John's food and raiment. Why should we not hold the same in this verse concerning St Mark, who is here in verbal agreement with St Matthew? We have an explanation of the reason why St Mark departed from Q's order in what I have already said as to the different purpose for which each quotes the prophecy of Isaiah.

But St Mark's obligation to Q comes out more clearly when we study the second dislocation of Q's order. In these opening verses St Mark inserts a prophecy of Malachi not found in this place in Matthew or Luke. But this is more properly to be described as a dislocation of order rather than as either an interpolation by the one Evangelist or an omission by the other two. For this prophecy is found elsewhere in Matthew and Luke (Matt. xi. 10; Luke vii. 27), in the section which contains the account of John's mission of two of his disciples to Jesus. This whole section is one of those which we refer to Q, as containing things common to Matthew and Luke, but omitted by St Mark. Supposing this section to have been contained in the earlier document, there is nothing surprising if St Mark, though acquainted with the incident, did not include it in his Gospel. In St Mark's opening verses, though verbal coincidences prove his

acquaintance with the account of the Baptist's preaching given by Q, yet it is evident that if St Mark used that account he abridged it very much; and as his object was to write the life of Jesus, not of John, he might well have deemed it outside his purpose to relate a later incident in the Baptist's life.

But that all three Synoptics drew their quotation of Malachi's prophecy from a common source appears from the fact that they all agree in variations from the Septuagint form of the prophecy, which runs, Ἰδοὺ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου. Here the New Testament form has ἀποστέλλω, instead of ἐξαποστέλλω; κατασκευάσει instead of ἐπιβλέψεται; and τὴν ὁδὸν σου instead of ὁδόν, St Mark agreeing in all three points with the other two Evangelists. But the argument which seems to me decisive is that the hypothesis that St Mark is here using Q gives the only admissible explanation of his ascription to Isaiah of a prophecy which really belongs to Malachi.

For St Mark's purpose the important words were not *in the wilderness*, but *prepare the way*, words which are common to the two prophetic texts cited. St Mark's object was to show that it had been predicted that the coming of the Messiah was to be preceded by that of one who was to prepare His way, and thus that the coming of this precursor was to be regarded as *the beginning* of the New Dispensation. Now in Q he could have found the passage from Malachi quoted without mention of the author's name, and simply with the formula *It is written* (Matt. xi. 10; Luke vii. 27). There was then nothing to remind St Mark that any inconvenience could arise from his joining the two sister predictions together, though one passage had already been introduced with the formula *As it is written in Isaiah the prophet*. I think then that, without proceeding further in our study, we may adopt the two following conclusions as proved: (1) that verbal coincidences between St Matthew and

St Luke are not to be explained by the supposition that either Evangelist copied the other, but rather that both used a source earlier than either. (2) That this earlier document was used by St Mark as well as by the other two Synoptics.

St Luke completes the quotation from Isaiah by the addition of the two verses which follow in the LXX. We cannot disprove the hypothesis that these verses were found in Q, and were omitted by St Matthew and St Mark as not relevant to their purpose; but it seems more probable that they were not contained in Q, and that St Luke did what the copiers of an abbreviated Old Testament quotation are very apt to do, namely, to complete it by adding the omitted context. The early Western authorities add these words in Matthew also, and in complete conformity with St Luke's form in the only important point in which it differs from the Septuagint, namely, that for the word *plain* in *the rough places plain*, the LXX (B) has εἰς πεδία; St Luke has εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας; the Latin has, *in vias planas*. It is likely that in Roman Church use the quotation in Matthew was read with the fulness to which the people were accustomed in Luke.

To the statement that John came preaching in the wilderness, St Matthew adds *of Judæa*, words not found in Mark or Luke, yet I have no hesitation in regarding these words as derived from the common original Q. When we attempt to restore Q, the agreement of St Matthew and St Luke against St Mark is a fact of great importance, because St Matthew and St Luke may be regarded as independent witnesses. But we have no reason to think the same of St Luke and St Mark; and, on the contrary, we shall find reason as we proceed to think that St Luke was indebted to St Mark; and I find moreover many reasons to think in other cases, where we derive a knowledge of Q both from St Matthew and St Luke, that St Matthew is the more trustworthy authority.

To a modern reader, the phrase *preaching in the wilderness* conveys the idea of a man preaching where there was no one to listen to him; and we are disposed to ask, why, if John came to preach, he should choose a place where he could not expect to find an audience? It must be borne in mind, in the first place, that the English word *wilderness* conveys an idea of greater desolation than the Greek ἔρημος. In fact, when we read further on of our Lord going to an ἔρημος τόπος, we may simply understand a place unencumbered by habitations or by human cultivation, which, though a large audience was not likely to be found there, was more convenient for addressing one than either the narrow streets of a small Eastern town or land occupied by growing crops. In Q, I take it, that the phrase *wilderness of Judæa* was used historically, to describe the place where John appeared as a preacher. The context leads us to think of it as a stretch of waste land adjacent to the lower Jordan, with scarcely any resident population, in which, uncultivated though it was, it was not impossible to find native growths capable of sustaining life. St Luke (iii. 2) describes the situation: John was in the wilderness, to which no doubt he had retired for solitude and meditation; there *the word of God came unto him*; and he preached, first to those in his immediate neighbourhood; and, as his fame spread, people *went out to him*, until at length at Jerusalem itself his preaching and its authority was thought worthy of investigation.

We have next to enquire whether, in restoring Q, we are to adopt St Matthew's version, *saying, repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*, or that in which St Mark and St Luke agree, *preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins*. That at least the words ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν come from Q we have independent evidence in Matt. x. 7, a passage which must be referred to Q, because, though not contained in Mark, it is reproduced in Luke x. 9, but with an addition which makes the words more

suitable when placed in our Lord's mouth, ἡγγικεν ἐφ' ὧμάς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. We need not doubt also that the exhortation *Repent* was part of the Baptist's message; for, besides St Matthew's testimony, we have also that of St Luke in Acts xiii. 24, where John is described as having preached *the baptism of repentance*. The full phrase μετανοεῖτε, ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is found twice in Matthew: once put in the mouth of John (iii. 2), and once in that of our Lord (iv. 17). A question arises whether this double mention was also made in Q. Perhaps if the phrase occurred only once in Q, it would seem more suitable in the mouth of him whose mission it was to announce the near approach of the Messiah. But that St Mark read it in Q, as used by our Lord, we may infer from his describing (i. 15), as the substance of our Lord's preaching, ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε, κ.τ.λ. On the other hand, the description *preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins* has all the marks of Lucan authorship. The phrase ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, though not found in the Septuagint, is frequent with St Luke. In any case we find that the phrase was in use in the circle in which both St Mark and St Luke moved, and therefore is one which might be used by either independently of the other.

It is to be noted that neither St Luke nor St Mark ever uses the phrase *kingdom of heaven*, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, which is found more than thirty times in Matthew, both substituting *kingdom of God*. It seems to me likely that all three Evangelists derived the phrase from the same Aramaic source, and that St Mark and St Luke substituted for St Matthew's literal translation one less likely to be misunderstood by the Gentile readers for whom they wrote; but all give us to understand that the good news which both our Lord and His forerunner proclaimed was the immediate coming of the Messiah's kingdom; and hence the phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας is used both by St Matthew and St Mark.

It is common with modern theorists to hold that the superiority of Christian baptism over John's was that remission of sins was conveyed by the former, and not by the latter. But in passages already cited the remission of sins by John's baptism is distinctly taught; and it must be borne in mind that John's baptism required a profession of belief in John's successor, Acts xix. 4; and it is especially the gift of the Holy Ghost which St Luke represents as the prerogative of Christian baptism (Acts i. 5; xix. 6). That John's baptism was sought for in order to gain remission of sins is evident also from the fact that this was the difficulty felt in admitting the statement that our Lord had been baptized by John. This appears from an extract from the Ebionite gospel which St Jerome has preserved (*Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2). "In Evangelio *juxta Hebræos*, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni *secundum Apostolos*, sive ut plerique autumant, *juxta Matthæum*, quod et in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca, narrat historia: *Ecce mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei, Johannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis, Quid peccavi ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est.*"

It is evidently the same story that is referred to in c. 17 of the tract *De Rebaptismate*, wrongly ascribed to Cyprian, which gives as the authority for the story the work called *The Preaching of Paul*. "Est autem adulterini huius immo internecini baptismatis si qui alius auctor, tum etiam quidam ab eisdem ipsis hæreticis propter hunc eundem errorem confictus liber qui inscribitur *Pauli Prædicatio*: in quo libro contra omnes scripturas et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Ioannis baptismum pæne invitum a matre sua Maria esse compulsus, item cum baptizaretur ignem super aquam esse visum quod in evangelio nullo est scriptum." See further, p. 410.

MARK i. 5, 6.

Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμεῖται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ἔξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσθων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

MATT. iii. 4-6.

Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ, ἡ δὲ τροφή ἦν αὐτοῦ ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον. Τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἔξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

St Matthew and St Mark give in almost identical words the description of the Baptist's food and raiment. They differ in arrangement: the two verses just quoted from Mark being transposed in Matthew. On account of the freedom of St Mark's dealings with Q I am disposed to believe that St Matthew here represents the order of the original. John's spare diet is referred to in the passage Matt. xi. 8; Luke vii. 25, which I have already claimed as derived from Q. There are two variations of language between St Matthew's account and St Mark's: St Matthew's ἡ τροφή αὐτοῦ is replaced in Mark by ἦν ἔσθων; and St Matthew's εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ by ἦν ἐνδεδυμένος. St Mark constantly employs as here (v. 6, ἦν ἐνδεδυμένος . . . καὶ ἔσθων), the substantive verb with a participle to express either an habitual action or a continuous state. But this practice is not so exclusively St Mark's that we can count instances of it as notes of Marcan origin. Examples of it abound in St Luke, both in Gospel and Acts (see, for example, Luke iv. 32, 44).

Following what I suppose to have been the original order of Q, I have considered the sixth verse of Mark before the fifth; but a few notes concerning that fifth verse may now be added.

St Matthew states that there went out to John *Jerusalem and all Judæa and all ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*. St Mark omits these last words; yet, as they are also found in Luke iii. 3, we can scarcely doubt that they came from Q. Instead of St Matthew's *Jerusalem and all Judæa*, St Mark has *all the country of Judæa and all*

they of Jerusalem, a variation which needs no comment, save that it is evidence that St Mark did not copy so slavishly as not to feel himself at liberty to alter the form of expression, so as to give a subject for the verb ἐβαπτίζοντο, which immediately follows. With regard to the tense of this verb, this is not an unsuitable place to remark that St Mark strictly abstains from using the aorist tense when not recording a definite act. He uses the imperfect tense, not only when speaking of an uncompleted or of a continuous action, but also when speaking of the act of a body of men, if, from the nature of the case, their action must have been successive, not simultaneous. Thus, in the present case, it was a succession of persons who came, one after another, and were baptized; and so we have the imperfects ἐξέπορεύετο and ἐβαπτίζοντο. In like manner, in relating the utterance of a single person, St Mark uses the aorist or the historic present, but the imperfect is used in such phrases as *The disciples said*, *The Pharisees said*, where several persons are introduced as speaking, who are not supposed to have spoken altogether. See p. 105. In the fourth chapter of Mark several sayings of our Lord are consecutively introduced with ἔλεγεν. In this case we are not obliged to suppose that all these sayings were part of a connected discourse. These imperfects might be translated *This also was a saying of Jesus*, which might have been uttered on the occasion of which the context speaks, or might also have been repeated on another occasion. The verb ἐξέπορεύετο, which I have just quoted, and in which St Matthew and St Mark agree, does not occur in St Luke's direct narrative, but is recognised by him immediately afterwards, where he tells us that John the Baptist spoke τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις.

THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST

St Matthew and St Luke now agree in giving an abstract of John's preaching which is not found in Mark.

Their verbal agreement is so close that we must suppose that both used the common source which I have called Q. As I have already given reasons for thinking that St Mark also was acquainted with Q, I conclude that in this place he abridged it, hastening on to what he needed for his purpose—the Baptist's announcement of the coming of our Lord. It will be convenient then to study in this place that section of Q which treats of John's preaching.

MATT. iii. 7-10.

Ἰδὼν δὲ πολλοὺς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; ποιήσατε οὖν καρπὸν ἁγίου τῆς μετανοίας· καὶ μὴ δόξητε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι δύναται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγείραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. ἥδη δὲ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κείται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

LUKE iii. 7-9.

Ἐλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀγίους τῆς μετανοίας· καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι δύναται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγείραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. ἥδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κείται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν [καλὸν] ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

There is no important difference between these two versions except in the introductory words; and with respect to these, I accept St Matthew's as the closer representation of Q. St Luke's introduction is clearly his own, for, as has been already remarked, his *ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις* represents the *ἐξεπορεύετο* attested by both St Matthew and St Mark, but omitted by St Luke in the preceding verse. St Luke's account does not explain why the crowds who flocked to John's baptism should meet so repellent a reception, and be addressed as *vipers' brood*; but St Matthew explains that the epithet was meant, not for the auditors generally, but for the Pharisees and Sadducees who had come to swell their number. We can easily understand that the sensation caused by John's preaching drew down from Jerusalem some prominent members of the leading sects who came to form their judgment of the new preaching, it may be with no friendly dispositions. And the

Baptist's rough reception is intelligible, as given to unexpected visitors concerning whom he had no reason to form a good opinion. Twice elsewhere, in passages both of which seem to have been drawn from Q, St Matthew repeats the words γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, as used by our Lord: in the first (xii. 34) the Pharisees are addressed; the second (xxiii. 33) occurs in the scathing rebukes of the Scribes and Pharisees uttered by our Lord on His last visit to Jerusalem.

MATT. iii. 9. Μὴ δόξετε. LUKE iii. 8. Μὴ ἄρξησθε.

In variations of this kind the idea naturally suggests itself that we have before us two different versions of a word in an Aramaic original. But in the present case no explanation of this kind has been given that I can accept as plausible. And since we shall find as we go on numerous instances where, if St Luke used a previous authority he must have substituted a word of his own for what he regarded as a less appropriate word in his original, I am disposed to the belief that he here found μὴ δόξετε in his original, and substituted for the somewhat difficult expression δόξετε the easier ἄρξησθε; ἄρχομαι being commonly used in narrative by all three Synoptics. Verbal changes might more easily occur if the hypothesis should be true which we shall afterwards have to consider, that St Luke obtained his knowledge of Q, not by study of a written document, but by having heard it read at the weekly meetings of Christians.

St Luke next gives the Baptist's answer to the question, *What shall we do?* put to him by the people generally, by the publicans, and by the soldiers. As there is nothing corresponding to this in Matthew or Mark, St Luke would seem to have used an independent authority, and he intimates (iii. 18) that he was acquainted with a fuller report of the Baptist's preaching than he has preserved for us. But it is quite possible that Q may have contained such a report. It is on account of the work done by John in *preparing the way* for

our Lord that it was necessary that the Gospel history should include an account of the mission of the Baptist; but it is intelligible that St Matthew, hastening on to tell of John's announcement that he was to be followed by a successor greater than himself, did not think it relevant to his purpose to relate at greater length other topics dwelt on in his preaching.

JOHN'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE MESSIAH

MATT. iii. 11.

Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν· ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.

MARK i. 7, 8.

Καὶ ἐκήρυσεν λέγων, Ἐρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω [μου], οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς κύβητας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

LUKE iii. 16.

Ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.

JOHN i. 26, 27.

Ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι· μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἰδατε, ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ [ἐγὼ] ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος.

The verbal coincidences here leave no room for doubt that St Matthew and St Luke are using their common authority Q, and that the common authority, as they used it, must have been in Greek. We need not doubt that St Mark used the same authority; and his omission of the clause *whose fan is in his hand, etc.* (Matt. iii. 12; Luke iii. 17) is only to be regarded as furnishing ground for the assertion that when St Mark uses Q, he is apt to abridge. For the same reason no stress is to be laid on St Mark's omission of the words *and with fire*, which in Matthew and Luke follow the words *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost*. Exegesis not being the object of this study, it would be irrelevant to discuss whether the double baptism is to be understood of two classes of persons: *with the Holy Ghost* being said of those who receive rightly, and *with fire* of those who do not, thus connecting the *πυρί* of St Matthew's eleventh

verse with the *πυρί ἀσβέστω* of his twelfth; or whether the *πυρί* is not to be understood as metaphorically representing the power of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii. 3).

In these verses St Mark has a small difference of order from St Matthew and St Luke. These two, doubtless following Q, begin with *ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι*. St Mark improves the strength of the sentence by putting this clause later. St Matthew adds *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, without support from the other two witnesses. The word *ικανός* is used in the sense of *worthy* in another section derived from Q, the healing of the centurion's servant, which is related by St Matthew (viii. 8), and by St Luke (vii. 6), but not by St Mark. In the present passage St John substitutes *ἄξιος* for *ικανός*.

We come now to the variation which needs most comment, viz., that whereas according to St Matthew, John says that he is not worthy *βαστάσαι τὰ ὑποδήματα* of his successor, according to St Mark he says that he is not worthy *κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ*. St Luke and St John agree in this *λῦσαι*, but have not *κύψας*; Justin Martyr twice has Matthew's *βαστάσαι* (*Trypho*, 49, 88). The explanation that most obviously occurs is that the origin of this variation was due to some ambiguity in the common Aramaic original; as, for example, if an Aramaic word could be found bearing the two meanings *to bear* and *to loose*, which might have been differently understood by two Evangelists; or if words respectively bearing one of these meanings could be found so like each other that one might conceivably have been substituted, in copying, for the other. But I have found no explanation of this kind which I can accept as convincing; and I am persuaded that the variation did not arise from the chance substitution of one word for another like it in sound, but from the deliberate alteration of a phrase which had ceased to be intelligible into another conveying the same idea.

I think we must accept the testimony of St Matthew, confirmed by Justin Martyr, that *βαστάσαι* was the word used in Q. The idea of carrying shoes, though

not familiar to us, cannot be quite strange to any one who has seen an Irish country girl walking barefoot on her way to fair or Mass, but carrying her shoes in her hand, which she puts on when she arrives close to the town for which she is bound. Such a one can easily understand that the Jews of our Lord's time thought that the shoes then worn were an encumbrance on a long walk, and preferred to be without them. Our Lord when He sent forth His disciples on missionary tours round the neighbouring towns, and directed them to take nothing in the nature of luggage with them, ordered them to take no shoes, otherwise no doubt each would have had to carry his shoes on the road. If a rabbi walked with his disciples, the shoes of the master would be carried by one of the disciples, and this is the office which John declares himself unworthy to fill towards his successor. But as the customs in the neighbourhood of Rome were not those of Palestine, St Mark, who according to the best information we have got, wrote for a Roman audience, omits the direction that the missionary apostles were to take no shoes, and substitutes that they were to wear only sandals (vi. 9).¹ To the same class of readers the idea of carrying shoes would be unfamiliar, and St Mark substitutes a kindred humble office, that of loosing the thong that kept the sandal in its place. I regard this change as made by St Mark, and copied from him by St Luke, and after him by St John (i. 27); for my whole study of the two Gospels forbids me to invert the relation between Mark and Luke. But I must in candour own that we should have expected that St Luke and St John, if they had been copying Mark, would also have copied the *κύνυας*, by which St Mark accentuates the humility of the office; this word in the Old Testament being commonly used of an act of worship. St Luke omits *ὀπίσω μου* which is attested by St Matthew, St Mark, and St John.

¹ In Mark vi. 9 the change of construction in *ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια* is recognised as natural when we see that at this point St Mark breaks off copying his original.

54 PROLOGUE OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

MARK i. 9.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου.

MATT. iii. 13.

Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

LUKE iii. 21.

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου

These accounts evidently were derived from a common source, which no doubt contained the statement that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized by John in Jordan. St Luke has abridged the account, hastening on to tell of the Baptist's proclamation of his successor. St Matthew and St Luke had already described Jesus as a dweller in Nazareth, and have no occasion to mention that name here; but it is retained by St Mark, in whose Gospel it here occurs for the first time.

It has been suggested that the *καὶ ἐγένετο*, which is common to St Mark and St Luke, indicates that both are translating from the Aramaic, this formula being of constant occurrence in the Septuagint, where it is used to render the Hebrew וַיְהִי. But the forms of speech in which a story has been originally told pass easily into another language, into which it has been translated. Biblical phraseology has stamped itself on the English language as appropriate to certain narratives. That this *ἐγένετο* is no more than a trick of style appears from the fact, that while it occurs but six times in St Matthew's Gospel, and four times in St Mark's, it appears to be a formula with St Luke, who uses it more than forty times in his Gospel, and more than twenty times in the Acts.

MATT. iii. 14, 15.

Ὁ δὲ διεκώλυεν αὐτὸν λέγων, Ἐγὼ χρεῖαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με; ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἄφες ἄρτι, οὕτω γὰρ πρέπειν ἐστὶν ἡμῶν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν.

St Matthew here adds, possibly from an independent

source, this account of the Baptist's reluctance to baptize our Lord. It might be supposed that St Matthew's account has here marks of a later date than the simple record of the baptism given by St Mark and St Luke, as indicating a time when it had become repugnant to the feelings of our Lord's disciples to believe that He had submitted to such an ordinance. But the story as told by St Mark and St Luke has such marks of being an abridgment that we cannot venture to assert that this section was not found in the authority which they followed; and we have early attestation to the antiquity of St Matthew's account in a passage of Ignatius (*Smyrn.* i.) βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου ἵνα πληρωθῇ πάντα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; where the words of St Matthew are plainly referred to. The story, as St Matthew tells it, may well have been contained in Q; for it expresses no other idea than is involved in the Baptist's announcement, which certainly formed part of the earliest Gospel, namely, that John was well aware of his inferiority to Him who was destined to be his successor. The question would at once arise, Why should the superior be baptized by His inferior? But the story which I have already quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews (p. 46) is the product of a later development of reflective Christian thought. It was suggested by quite another difficulty: John's baptism required confession of sins, of which those who applied for baptism hoped to gain remission. What sins had Jesus to confess? and of what could He apply to gain remission?

MARK i. 10, 11.

Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαλὼν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ φωνὴ [ἐγένετο] ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

MATT. iii. 16, 17.

Βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεψύχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὥσει περιστερὰν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

LUKE iii. 21b, 22.

ἀνεψυχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

The next difference between our Gospels that needs to be noticed is, that St Mark represents the opening of the heavens and the descent of the Holy Ghost as something seen by our Lord; and we should suppose that it was from His narration of it that the disciples obtained their knowledge. St Matthew relates the opening of the heavens historically, but agrees with St Mark in relating the descent of the Holy Ghost as seen by our Lord; St Luke relates both phenomena historically; St John rests belief in the descent of the Holy Ghost on the testimony of the Baptist, who declared, *I have seen, and have borne witness* (John i. 34). But the account in the Fourth Gospel does not quite harmonise with that in the First; for if it was only through the descent of the Holy Ghost that the Baptist learnt that Jesus was to be his greater successor, and if that descent took place at the time of the Baptism, it does not give the explanation of John's reluctance to admit our Lord to his baptism. It seems to me possible that in the history as related by Q the εἶδεν had an ambiguous position, so that the nominative to the verb might be taken either as John or as Jesus. This history has its echoes elsewhere in the New Testament. I cannot help thinking that the designations of Jesus as ὁ ἡγαπημένος (Eph. i. 6), and as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (Col. i. 13) are to be referred to this proclamation of the Father's love.

There is, however, another variation which we are bound to consider in connexion with the preceding. St Matthew represents the voice from heaven as saying, *This is my beloved Son*; St Mark and St Luke as saying, *Thou art my beloved Son*. Now if the vision were seen by the Baptist and others, we should expect the testimony to be borne in the form, *This is my beloved Son*, but that the second person would be used if our Lord Himself only were addressed. Thus then if in Q the subject of the verb εἶδεν had been understood to be John, *This is* could have been the word used; but if in the readings of the Christian assemblies the subject

had come to be Jesus, then it would have been natural to turn the address into the second person, so as to correspond more closely with Psalm ii. 7, which is applied to our Lord (Acts xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5; v. 5). Some old Latin MSS. make the words uttered by the voice from heaven to have been *Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee*; and this reading is attested by Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 88, 103).

The evidence is not sufficient to warrant any positive assertion on either side; but, as a general rule, when there is a variation between St Matthew and St Luke in their reproduction of Q, I am disposed to believe that St Matthew is the nearer to the original. On this principle I accept *This is my beloved Son* as the original reading of Q, and I consider *Thou art my beloved Son* as the form which the utterance had assumed in the recitations in the Christian assemblies before St Mark's Gospel was written.

I feel myself bound in candour to state the arguments for the opposite view, namely, that *Thou* was the original reading of Q. The strongest point in favour of this view is that *Thou* was read by Justin Martyr, who as a resident in Palestine was likely to have been acquainted with Q in its original form, which it is supposed was in Aramaic. I must say that I vehemently doubt Justin's having much knowledge of Aramaic. All his references to that language lead me to think that he knew about as much of it as an Englishman resident in an Irish speaking district usually knows of the native language; that is to say, he knows that there is such a language, and may have picked up a few phrases of it, but is not able to sustain a conversation in it, much less to read a book in it. And I believe that the reading for which he is now cited came from a Greek source; and it is possible that that source may have been the Ebionite Gospel of which I have given an account (*Introd. N. T.*, p. 159 *sqq.*).

The εὐθὺς ἀνέβη of St Matthew has the air of being derived from the εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων of St Mark, with whom

εὐθύς is a favourite word ; but it is not so exclusively his as to afford conclusive proof of obligation. And a study of the whole narrative of the events which preceded the call of Peter leads to the conclusion that in this part of the history it is not St Matthew who has copied St Mark, but St Mark who has copied, if not St Matthew, at least the authority to which St Matthew was indebted, and which for the present I call Q. That St Mark is here copying Q is made probable by his using the plural *οὐρανοί*. St Matthew habitually does so, St Luke scarcely ever. St Mark almost always uses the singular, except when there is reason to suspect that he is following Q. But I notice in other places that when St Mark copies Q, he uses considerable liberty in changing the form of expression. There is here a remarkable divergence between the two Evangelists : St Matthew's phrase is *The heavens were opened*, *ἠνεόχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί* ; St Mark tells us that *Jesus saw the heavens* *σχιζομένους*. In this chapter St Matthew is copying Q, and is more likely to have preserved the very words of his original than St Mark, who has greatly abridged the story, of which therefore he might easily be content to give the sense in his own words. St Matthew's language follows O. T. usage, *ἠνοίχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδον ὀράσεις θεοῦ* (Ezek. i. 1). It is to be noted that *ἀνοίγω* is the verb used in two plain references to our Lord's baptism in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. R. Sinker), *οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀνοιγίσκονται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς δόξης ἡῤῥει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἁγίασμα μετὰ φωνῆς πατρικῆς ὡς ἀπο Ἀβραὰμ πατρὸς Ἰσαάκ. καὶ δόξα ὑψίστου ἐπ' αὐτὸν ῥηθήσεται, καὶ πνεῦμα συνέσεως καὶ ἁγιασμοῦ καταπαύσει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι* (*Levi*, 18) and, *καὶ ἀνοιγίσκονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐκχέει πνεύματος εὐλογίαν πατρὸς ἁγίου* (*Judah*, 24).

With regard to St Mark's frequent use of *εὐθύς*, it may be remarked that in St Matthew's Gospel the phrase *καὶ ἰδοὺ* occurs with like frequency, and that Weiss is disposed to regard every recurrence of this formula as indicating the use of an Aramaic source, this Greek phrase representing the Hebrew *וְהִנֵּה*. It is

remarkable that this phrase *καὶ ἰδοὺ* does not occur in St Mark, whom both tradition and the character of his Gospel leads us to believe was well acquainted with Aramaic. Yet twice in Genesis (xv. 4; xxxviii. 29) the Septuagint renders this Hebrew phrase by *καὶ ἰδοὺ*. I do not look on the use of this phrase as more than a trick of style, such as frequently passes from one language to another, and I do not think that we are entitled to infer that wherever the phrase *καὶ ἰδοὺ* occurs in a Greek Gospel there must have been *ܩܝܝܬܐ* in an Aramaic Gospel; but my theory is that St Mark, in exercising his function as *ἐρμηνευτής*, was accustomed to use the equivalent *καὶ εὐθύς* where a more literal interpreter would have rendered *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, and thus that the former phrase passed into his own style.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS

MARK i. 12.

Καὶ εὐθύς τὸ πνεῦμα
αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν
ἐρημον.

MATT. iv. 1.

Τότε [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη
εἰς τὴν ἐρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ
πνεύματος, πειρασθῆναι
ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.

LUKE iv. 1.

Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύ-
ματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν
ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ
ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν
τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

The story of our Lord's Temptation is clearly one for which we are obliged to postulate a source Q; for St Matthew and St Luke agree closely in a long narrative which they could not have learnt from St Mark, who gives an extremely brief account of the same history, which they must therefore have learnt from some other common source. Having already seen reason to believe that St Mark was acquainted with Q, which he sometimes abridged, it is much more natural to hold that St Mark's account is an abridgment of the longer narrative employed by St Matthew and St Luke than that their account was an expansion of St Mark's. We shall presently have to consider whether or not St Mark was also in possession of some other source of information; but St Mark's divergence from the other two Synoptics does not commence until after his twelfth

verse. He agrees with them in connecting the account of our Lord's temptation with that of His baptism. It was the Spirit that was then poured on Him which drove Him into the wilderness.

Ἰησοῦς ἀνίχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος.—It seems to me that St Mark here purposely altered the language of Q, which St Matthew has preserved, but which was liable to be misinterpreted. These words might be misunderstood as describing a bodily transference through the air; and it is likely that such an interpretation actually was given them, since Origen (*Comm. in Johan*, tom. ii. 6) repeats, as from the Hebrew Gospel, a statement that the Holy Ghost had taken Jesus by one of His hairs and carried Him to the great mountain Tabor. This interpretation was suggested by Ezek. viii. 3, and by a story in Bel and the Dragon of a like transporting of the prophet Habakkuk, to bring food to Daniel in the lions' den. We can understand then why St Mark altered the language, so as to exclude the idea of a mechanical removal, independent of the will of the subject of the miracle; and instead to represent that Jesus was so filled by the Holy Spirit that His human organs, not independently of His will, but by His will, became instruments to obey the Spirit's motions.

But I think we cannot fully apprehend the idea intended to be conveyed without taking into account the parallel case (Luke viii. 29), of a man possessed by an evil spirit, ἡλαίνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους, where certainly no force is supposed to be in operation, but the overmastering influence over the demoniac's will of the evil spirit which possessed him. Analogy would lead us to think that the will of one taken possession of by the Holy Spirit would be subject to a similar constraint; but we have not faculties to determine how far such an analogy would hold when what we are speaking of is the human will of our Lord Himself.

MARK i. 13.

Καὶ ἦν ἐν ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ,
καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

This account, though so much shorter than that of St Matthew and St Luke (Matt. iv. 2-11; Luke iv. 2-13), falls in with it so completely as to suggest that both drew from the same source. For instance, though St Mark does not mention our Lord's fast, yet he tells of the *forty days* which finds its original place most naturally in the story as told in Matthew and Luke, where the forty days are connected with our Lord's fasting, in accordance with the Old Testament parallels (Ex. xxxiv. 28; 1 Kings xix. 8).

St Mark gives no details of our Lord's temptation, but merely says that He was forty days being tempted, *πειραζόμενος*, by *Satan*; St Matthew and St Luke say by *the devil*. St Mark's Aramaic word suggests that Q may have been written in Aramaic. The present is not the only occasion on which St Mark uses Aramaic words (such as Corban, Ephphatha), a thing very natural for the Evangelist to do if he was using Aramaic sources. The question of the truth of the tradition that St Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Aramaic will subsequently come up for consideration. In the present case, any argument founded on the use of the word *Σατανᾶς* is a precarious one, for the word early came to be naturalised in the Christian community as an equivalent for *ὁ διάβολος* (see Apoc. xii. 9; xx. 2). The word is freely used not only by St Paul, who spoke Aramaic, but also by St Luke, concerning whom we have no evidence that he could, and by Justin Martyr, who gives an etymology for the word which exhibits his ignorance of the language (*Trypho*, 103; from *sata*=apostate and *nas*=serpent).

Possibly it was because St Mark did not design to give the details of our Lord's temptation that he also omitted to mention His fasting; for if he did not design

to tell how our Lord refused to command stones to be made bread, he might naturally say nothing of the fast which gave force to that temptation. We are not bound to suppose that our Lord's fasting was voluntary in any other sense than that it resulted from His voluntary act of retirement to a place removed from human society. John, retiring to what seems to have been the same place, was forced to live on the natural products of the desert, and these, which at any time must have afforded but scanty sustenance, may possibly have been even less abundant on the occasion of our Lord's visit, which may have been at a different season.

St Mark, however, has some things not to be found in Matthew or Luke. He says that our Lord *was with the wild beasts*; and when we ask, what wild beasts He was likely to find there, the question arises, Are we bound to suppose that St Mark found this in a document other than that used by St Matthew and St Luke? or may it be that St Mark merely means to describe our Lord as so completely remote from human society as to have no companions but the beasts, and no attendants but the angels? In St Matthew's account the attendance of the angels is not represented as beginning until Satan's departure; St Luke does not mention it here; but the disputed passage (Luke xxii. 43) may be connected with this one. We must also take into account the possibility that St Mark may have derived some touches, not from a document, but from *viva voce* utterances of St Peter.

If, however, the idea should be suggested that the account given by St Matthew and St Luke was but a development of St Mark's simpler story, I will not dwell on the difficulty of seeing why an incident so bare as that which St Mark relates should have been recorded at all; but I must express my belief that nothing in the Gospels has stronger tokens of being a genuine Apostolic tradition than this story of our Lord's temptation.

In the first place, there is nothing which the disciples were less likely to have invented. As things are, a

Christian preacher taking this narrative for his subject feels that his hearers will require him to try to solve a difficulty. They will desire him to explain how, when the Human Nature and the Divine were united in One Person, the Human Nature could be subject to temptation at all. He is grateful to Christian philosophic thinkers who have taught him that the most perfect human nature we can conceive of is still liable to temptation from the necessary conflict which arises when it is perceived that desires which are strongly felt, and the gratification of which ordinarily would be perfectly innocent, under certain circumstances ought not to be yielded to. Even granting that our Lord's first hearers did not at first think of Him so highly as they afterwards learnt to do, yet thinking of His goodness as they did, the idea would not naturally occur to them that He was liable to be tempted even as they. If one of ourselves has come in contact with a man pre-eminently holy and good, there is a natural shame to acknowledge to him the stirrings to evil in our own hearts, from the feeling that this is an experience which he is not likely to have had. We may have successfully resisted the temptation to do wrong ; but we are somewhat ashamed of having wanted to do it, and having needed a struggle to refrain. We feel that one who stands on a higher moral level than ourselves would not only refrain from doing the wrong thing, but that the thought of doing it would be too revolting to be seriously entertained. Thus, while from the nature of the case, the story told by the Evangelists could rest on no authority but that of our Lord's own narration, it is extremely improbable that any one should falsely invent such a story for Him.

Yet when we examine into the character of the temptations which our Lord is said to have sustained, we can see, in the first place, that these were temptations which it is quite credible that He should have felt, yet unlikely to have been invented for Him ; and, in the second place, that there were occasions when it would

be natural that He should relate the story to His disciples.

The temptations are such as scarcely any one but Himself could have had experience of. They all turn on the conflict that arises when one who is conscious that he is possessed of supernatural power feels that there are occasions when it would not be right that he should exercise it. Why should the Son of God suffer hunger, if it needed but a word from Him to have His wants miraculously supplied? Why should He have to complain of the unbelief and stupidity of the men who had seen enough of His power to have good reason to trust Him, if by some more stupendous manifestation of His gifts He could constrain their assent? Why should He submit to the obstacles which an unseen enemy was constantly casting in His path, if by some concession His foe's hostility could be disarmed? These are not temptations which assail an ordinary man. They are not temptations such as have been ascribed to any one else. Every one feels that it would be a degradation to our Lord to imagine Him suffering from those pangs of sexual desire which have always presented the readiest material to those painters who have set themselves to invent temptations for St Anthony. Milton, though he escapes this snare, yet, when in his *Paradise Regained* he expands the Gospel history, he makes the first temptation one addressed to the senses, describing the dainties by which the Tempter strove to influence an appetite which one might have supposed needed no sharpening after so long a fast. But in the Gospel we are only told of the intellectual difficulty, How was it possible that the Son of God should suffer hunger? It is only one who believes that he has power to constrain the ordinary forces of nature to obey him who has need to consider whether there are limits beyond which it would not be proper for him to exercise that power.

But, moreover, as it would not be likely for the disciples, untold, to attribute such an experience to their

Master, so there were occasions when, if He had had such an experience, it was likely He should tell them of it. The disciples who had seen their Master's mighty works, and had begun to think it possible that it might be He who should redeem Israel, would naturally be astonished at the lowly position He was content with. Why should not He who did so many miracles for the benefit of others, employ some of His wonderful power for the benefit of Himself and His companions? We are told by St Luke (viii. 3) that their little band was supported, in their circuits, by grateful women who, having been recipients of miraculous benefit from Jesus, ministered to Him of their substance. Why should Jesus and His disciples be dependent on others? Why should not He who had miraculously fed the multitudes, similarly provide food for Himself and for those who were with Him? We can see one reason why He might have refused to do so, when we read what St John (chap. vi.) tells of the effect produced when He fed the multitudes, viz., that many followed Him from no better motive than *because they did eat of the loaves and were filled*. We must note also that though our Lord (see Matt. viii. 19-22; Luke ix. 57-62) rejected the pleas of some who hesitated to obey His command to follow Him, yet when another volunteered to *follow Him whithersoever He went*, possibly tempted by the prospect of an easy life, in which he would not have to labour for his own support, our Lord taught him that the office which he coveted was one in which he could expect no other earthly recompense for his labour than the precarious subsistence which was all that He Himself received.

But there was something higher to which the ambition of the disciples reached. With such a miracle worker at their head, an uprising of the Jewish people to shake off the foreign yoke might be counted sure of success; and the triumphant leader would become king, with ample power to reward His followers. St John tells us that the effect on the spectators of Christ's miracle of feeding the multitude was such that if He had not

withdrawn Himself, they would have attempted by force to make Him a king. When Jesus saw thoughts like these filling the minds of His disciples, some expression of these thoughts might easily elicit from Him the narrative how Satan had tried Him with like temptations, and how He had resisted them.

We are told (Matt. xvi. 21 ; Mark ix. 31) that when our Lord announced to His disciples the rejection and sufferings He was to meet with at Jerusalem, the disciples could not believe that their contemplated journey could have an issue so contrary to their hopes ; and that Peter endeavoured to persuade his Master to retract His prediction. But he only received the stern rebuke, *Get thee behind me, Satan*, words which would at once convey to the Apostle that he was then acting the part that the Arch-tempter had played before. Indeed, it may well be doubted whether Jesus would have addressed a fervent disciple in words so terrible, if He had not already told the story which explained the sense in which these words were to be understood. St Luke has not included in his Gospel an account of this rebuke to Peter, yet the remark which closes his account of the first temptation, *the devil . . . departed from him for a season*, shows his knowledge that our Lord had taught His disciples to regard other attempts to deter Him from His accomplishment of His predicted work as instigated by the same Tempter. St Luke and St John agree in representing the betrayal of our Lord by Judas as due to the direct instigation of Satan (Luke xxii. 3 ; John xiii. 2, 27).

Examining now more closely the accounts of the Temptation given by St Matthew and St Luke, we find great general resemblance, and one striking difference. Both relate three temptations ; the temptations are in both substantially the same ; in our Lord's answers the same passages from the O. T. are quoted ; and, in both authorities, in the words of the Septuagint. The phrase common to both, τὸ πτερύγιον, would seem to indicate that the two accounts have a common Greek original.

Though both accounts agree in placing first the temptation to command that stones should be converted into bread, they differ as to the relative order of the second and third temptations; yet this transposition does not remove a remarkable agreement. St Matthew makes the first two of the temptations begin *If thou art the Son of God*; St Luke has the same preface to the same two temptations, though they no longer stand in the same order. In other words, the agreement is complete, as far as each individual narrative is concerned, but two of them have been transposed bodily. My own belief is that St Matthew has preserved the original order of the common authority; but I have not been able to discover any doctrinal or other object to be gained by altering that order.

Under the circumstances, no explanation of the variation can be more than conjectural; but I shall state that which most commends itself to me. On comparing the Sermon on the Mount recorded by St Matthew with a corresponding discourse in Luke, the idea presented itself to me very strongly that St Matthew drew his information from a document, while St Luke got his from the Greek oral relation in the Christian assemblies. But the memory of the most attentive hearer, though it might faithfully retain the stories told on any occasion, might easily let slip the order in which they had been told; and until some plausible explanation can be given of a reason for a designed change of the order of the temptations, I think this is one of the variations between the Evangelists, of which a failure of memory gives the simplest, and a sufficient, account.

Confining now, for the moment, our attention to the first temptation, instead of regarding, with Professor Cheyne (*Encycl. Bibl.*), the story so impossible that it must be ascribed to a late invention, we find that it coheres indissolubly with the record of our Lord's baptism. It will be owned by all who have studied our Lord's discourses that there is nothing more clearly

manifested in them than His conviction of the Fatherhood of God, and of His readiness to supply the wants of His children. If any ask Him, and fail to receive, it must be on account of their own want of faith; for Jesus taught His disciples, *All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them* (Mark xi. 24). If such are the privileges of the ordinary child of God, what must be the power of Him who had heard Himself saluted from heaven as *The beloved Son of God*? This was the temptation which the Spirit drove Him into the wilderness to encounter. If He retired to those desert places where the Baptist had before contrived without human help to sustain life, should He have occasion to experience the same difficulty? And when the natural supply of food was found to be as scanty as ever, might not He who had power to constrain nature exercise His privilege? The real temptation was the temptation to doubt; and when Satan cried *If thou art the Son of God*, to ask Himself, *Am I*?

In choosing between the orders in which St Matthew and St Luke arrange the temptations, I am not only guided by the preference which in corresponding cases I have found myself disposed to give to St Matthew's order. In this case it seems most natural that the two which begin with *If thou art the Son of God* should be placed first, and that the story should come to a close with our Lord's indignant *Be gone Satan*, when the Tempter makes the outrageous demand of worship. Indeed it would seem surprising that he should continue his efforts after so decided a repulse; and so St Luke appears to have felt, for, according to the testimony of the oldest MSS., he omits the ὑπαγε Σατανᾶ altogether, though later authorities have in this respect assimilated his account to St Matthew's. It is, however, much easier to understand why St Luke should have omitted these words, when found in connexion with what was not the concluding temptation, than why St Matthew should have gratuitously inserted them.

Little need be said about smaller variations between St Matthew's and St Luke's accounts. For instance, in the account of the first temptation, St Luke uses the singular number, *command this stone that it become a loaf*, where St Matthew uses the plural; and in the second temptation, while St Matthew uses the phrase *the holy city*, possibly derived from Q, St Luke plainly says *Jerusalem*. But it is in the third temptation that there are more signs of studied variation on St Luke's part. St Luke makes no mention of the *exceeding high mountain*, from which, according to St Matthew's account, *all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them* were to be seen; but he echoes the latter phrase, though at some expense of the clearness of the grammar, for he reports Satan as saying, *To thee will I give all this authority, and the glory of them*. St Luke adds the clause, which St Matthew does not record, *for it hath been delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it*. Where St Matthew has the simple phrase *If thou wilt fall down and worship me*, St Luke has *worship before me*. It may be remarked that ἐνώπιον, though a common LXX word, is not used in Matthew or Mark, but occurs more than twenty times in St Luke's Gospel, and fifteen times in the Acts. Different explanations of these phenomena may be given; but the view that most strongly commends itself to me is that while St Matthew and St Luke were both indebted to Q, the former adhered to his original more slavishly than the latter thought himself bound to do.

The study of Q, in which we have thus far engaged, deserves attention, because it is the earliest of all the Gospels of which we have knowledge. It is earlier than Matthew or Luke, because it is, by definition, the source of certain narratives common to both, which they do not seem to have copied one from the other; and we have found reason to believe that St Mark also made use of it; and therefore it is earlier than his Gospel likewise. Our attempts to ascertain what is to be known

of it are easier in this earlier part of the history, concerning which St Mark tells us little, just as the attempt to decipher a palimpsest are easier the less modern writing has been written over it. Where the same narrative is told by all three Synoptics we have to take into account the supposition that Mark, either in its present or in an earlier form, may have been the source to which the other two were indebted. But here we are able to set aside that hypothesis. On the other hand, we must bear in mind the possibility that *Q* may have been the common source of things found in all three Synoptics; for it would be absurd to suppose that the only occasions when St Matthew and St Luke used *Q* were those in which St Mark did not use it too.

Even the little we have yet learnt enables us to discard one speculation about the earliest form of the Gospels. In the statement of Papias that St Matthew wrote τὰ λόγια in Hebrew, Schleiermacher interpreted λόγια to mean "inspired sayings"; and inferred that the earliest form of the Gospels was a collection of our Lord's sayings made in Hebrew by St Matthew. But it is very unlikely that the earliest form of Matthew could have differed completely in character from *Q*, which was largely used by the editor of the Gospel in its present form; and *Q* was clearly not a mere collection of sayings, but a historical narration of the same character as the other Gospels which have come down to us; relating not merely our Lord's baptism and temptation, but giving also an introductory sketch of the preaching of His fore-runner.

In stating the conclusions I have come to, as to the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels, it is necessary to make a difficult choice. It would not be convincing to state conclusions, without presenting also the reasons on which they are founded. Yet evidently it would not be safe to rely on inferences drawn from the study of a single passage. But if we go systematically through one of the Gospels, and examine the sections told by more Evangelists than one, and attempt to determine

which of the accounts has the best right to be regarded as that from which the others have been derived, we constantly find the evidence in one particular case not sufficient to decide the question, without taking other cases into consideration. I think it best therefore to state provisionally the conclusions at which I have myself arrived, leaving the reader to judge, as we go along, whether they are at variance with any of the facts that come before us. I have already intimated that, for all that part of the history which precedes the calling of Peter, all three Synoptics use the common authority Q, which St Matthew and St Luke supplement differently, with information derived from other sources. From this point on, though there are a few cases where no two Evangelists relate the events in the same order, yet when two agree in their order against the third, St Mark is always one of the two. I find also that in several cases St Mark gives trustworthy information, which enables us to understand better the account given by the other Evangelists; and this has led me to find it credible that St Mark had been the organ through which the recollections of St Peter had been delivered to the Church; and that for some of his elucidations of previous accounts St Mark had the authority of that Apostle. I believe that St Matthew's Gospel, in its original draft, was founded mainly on Q; but that before it assumed its present form St Mark's Gospel was made use of. I believe likewise that, in whole sections of the Third Gospel, St Luke follows Mark, though he often forsakes his guidance in order to incorporate matter derived from elsewhere; and the idea that St Mark's order is not chronological is difficult to reconcile with the fact already stated that in the arrangement of the history of our Lord's life from the calling of Peter to the Crucifixion, if St Mark has not the support of both the other Synoptics, he always has that of one of them.

I find in St Mark's Gospel notes of time and of the sequence of events to which there is no parallel in the other Gospels. I cannot take a better example than

the account which St Mark gives of the incidents that immediately followed the calling of Simon and Andrew, James and John, which is related in Mark i. 16-20. Then follows (vv. 21-28), the account of our Lord's teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum, and of His there healing a man with an unclean spirit, and of the sensation caused by the manner of His teaching, and by this miracle; next (vv. 29-34) we read of our Lord going straight from the synagogue into the house of Simon and Andrew, and there raising from sickness Simon's wife's mother; then how, on the same day after sunset, a crowd gathered round the door (no doubt stirred by the report of this miracle) bringing with them their sick, and obtaining cures from Him. The statement that it was only after sunset that the sick were moved, falls in with what we learn from Mark, namely, that the day was the Sabbath, before the expiration of which the carrying of burdens was forbidden. We are next told (vv. 35-38) how our Lord escaped the importunity of the crowds by rising early next morning and betaking Himself to a solitary place; how Simon and his companions followed Him and pressed Him to return, but that He refused, and took them with Him, as He went to preach in other towns of Galilee. We cannot be surprised at St Mark's describing with so much circumstantiality the incidents of a single day, if it be true that St Mark had his information from St Peter, in whose memory this day, the first after his having been called to follow Jesus, must have stood out more prominently than any other.

Turning now to St Matthew's Gospel we find him relating the history of the call of the four Apostles (iv. 18-22) in substantially the same words as St Mark. I confess it seems to me likely that St Matthew is not here abridging St Mark's fuller account, but that both are telling the story in nearly the same way as it had already been told in Q. Of the other things told by St Mark as having occurred on the same day, St Matthew only tells two, viz., the healing of Peter's

wife's mother, and the ministry to the crowds who collected in the evening; but why at that time of the day no hint is given. These things are told in St Matthew's eighth chapter, and not in connexion with the calling of the Apostles, which had been recorded in the fourth. St Matthew also makes our Lord escape the crowds by crossing to the other side of the lake. On the whole, my conclusion is that St Matthew is here not using Mark, but Q, whose anecdotes St Mark has placed in their proper connexion, and with fuller details.

If the order of either of the other two Synoptics is to be preferred to that of St Mark, we should expect it to be St Luke's, whose undertaking *καθεξῆς γράψαι* would lead us to expect chronological arrangement. Yet on the first occasion of a clear difference of order between St Mark and St Luke we are forced to give the preference to St Mark. St Luke's account of our Lord's teaching work begins by telling that, after the Temptation, He *returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and . . . taught in their synagogues*; and the first town, of His work in which any detailed account is given, is Nazareth. We are told that He had to leave that town on account of the bad reception He met there, and how He then preached at Capernaum. On the other hand, it is with Capernaum that the account of St Matthew and St Mark begins. It was in the neighbourhood of that town, which was close to the shore of the lake, that He called the four disciples from their fishing occupations, and chose them to be His followers. Then we read of His making a circuit of preaching in the Galilean towns; and it is quite late in the story (Matt. xiii. 53; Mark vi. 1) that we read of His visit to Nazareth.

The account of our Lord's reception at Nazareth given by St Luke completely harmonises with that as told by the other two Evangelists; and it is only with respect to the order of narration that there can be said to be a difference. But the discourse at Nazareth reported by St Luke clearly indicates that it was delivered, not at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, but

after His fame as a teacher and a worker of miracles had already gone abroad. Nay, the main topic of this discourse is to answer the complaint that He had not wrought in His own city such miracles as He had performed *at Capernaum* (iv. 23). For it is thus that St Luke first mentions Capernaum. He seems to think it necessary to explain what Capernaum was, when, some verses afterwards (iv. 31), he has to tell of our Lord's visit to that city. This is one of many examples in which we find that St Luke's order of narration is not the chronological order; and we have cause to think that the phrase *καθεξῆς γράψαι* was not meant to convey any promise that he would observe that order in his narration.

What I understand St Luke's purpose to have been was to arrange in a continuous narrative those anecdotes of our Saviour's life and teaching which the disciples had hitherto known in the fragmentary form which the necessities of oral delivery had imposed. In the Christian Church it has never been found convenient or possible to read the whole of one of the Gospels through at one time. What we call "the reading of the Gospel" on every Sunday is nothing more than the recitation of some selected portion of one of the works of the four Evangelists; and it is not likely that the earlier recitation of the history could have been on a different scale. But the extension of the Christian Church brought in more and more disciples of the educated classes, who would not be content with hearing sections of the story told, but desired, by reading the whole continuously, to *know the certainty concerning the things wherein they had been orally instructed*. This was the want which St Luke, and the other authors of written Gospels, attempted to supply.

THE FIRST PREACHING BY JESUS

MARK i. 14, 15.

Καὶ μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆ-
ναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ
Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν,
κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
τοῦ θεοῦ [καὶ λέγων], "Ὅτι
πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ
ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ
θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε καὶ πισ-
τεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

MATT. iv. 12-17.

Ακούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἰωάννης
παρεδόθη ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς
τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, κ.τ.λ.

LUKE iv. 14, 15.

Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰη-
σοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ
πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλι-
λαίαν. καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν
καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου
περὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδ-
ασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς
αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ
πάντων.

In my opinion we have in this verse the beginning of the specially Petrine tradition: *After that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of [the kingdom of] God.* If it were not for the conjunction καί with which the Evangelist connects, however loosely, what follows with what has gone before, this verse gives no indication that it is not the beginning of a completely independent narrative. We must note what it does not state, as well as what it does. It states, for instance, that Jesus came into Galilee, but it does not state, whence He came. It may have been, as the other Evangelists would lead us to think, immediately from the scene of the Temptation; but St Mark does not say so; on the contrary, we should be led to suppose that there was some considerable interval between the Temptation and the call of our Lord's first coadjutors in His work, which we are told took place after John had been apprehended. The Fourth Evangelist certainly believed (iv. 1) that there was a time during which John and Jesus were simultaneously carrying on the work of baptism. Now John was clearly at liberty at the time of our Lord's baptism, which was immediately followed by

His retirement to the wilderness. Any argument founded on the silence of the Evangelists must always be precarious; but we certainly should have expected that if John's apprehension had occurred, either during the forty days of the Temptation, or very soon after it, the account of this occurrence would have followed that of the Baptism and Temptation in the direct narrative of the Evangelists. And if all had been from the first intended to read consecutively, there would have been no need of a special note of time to mark the date.

But why should the call of the Apostles be thus dated, *after John's imprisonment*? On this point Matthew agrees with Mark. If to the question, why the call of the disciples should be connected with John's imprisonment, we can only give a conjectural answer, there is at least a sufficiently probable explanation. The call of these Apostles was not simply a call to believe in Jesus, but a call to *follow Him*. On this call, we are told, Simon and Andrew forsook their nets, the sons of Zebedee left their father with his hired servants in the ship, and thenceforward went about as our Lord's companions, hearing His teaching, and ultimately commissioned to go about as His envoys, making the same proclamation to others. In like manner, Levi the publican abandoned his occupation when summoned to follow our Lord. The first-sight impression is that they all made these sacrifices at the bidding of a stranger; and we could not account for their obedience except as a miraculously inspired impulse.

But the Fourth Evangelist supplies a solution which has such intrinsic probability that we cannot hesitate to accept it. The fishermen whom Jesus called were no strangers to Him. They had been disciples of the Baptist, and had been taught by him to recognise in Jesus his destined successor, who was to be greater than himself. Yet the new Teacher did not break their allegiance to their old master, nor at first summon them to go about with Him. That com-

mand to follow Him did not come until imprisonment had put an end to the Baptist's work as a teacher. Thus, then, it was natural that St Peter, when relating the story of his being called to follow our Lord, should date the call as given *after John was delivered up*.

Nor is there anything to surprise us if St Peter should commence the *viva voce* history of his connexion with our Lord without giving any preliminary explanation who John was, or how he came to be imprisoned—things so well known to his hearers that there was no need to inform them of them. These preliminary explanations did not become necessary until the Apostles' recollections came to be written down for the instruction of strangers who had no previous knowledge of the facts. Thus the tradition that St Mark is here but recording the story as told by St Peter explains all that might be pronounced faulty in the arrangement of a history written down for the information of strangers. But, from the latter point of view, the arrangement is certainly open to criticism, and is not such as two historians would be likely to adopt independently. Therefore, when we find St Matthew and St Mark agreeing in dating an event, as *after John's imprisonment*, without ever having mentioned that he had been imprisoned (Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 12), and both also agreeing in relating the imprisonment later on (Mark vi. 17; Matt. xiv. 3), as if by an afterthought, when the mention of Herod's idea that Jesus was John, whom he had beheaded, risen from the dead, makes it appropriate to give an account of John's imprisonment and death, we can hardly resist the inference that one of these Evangelists must have borrowed from the other. As we proceed in the study, we shall find many reasons for thinking that if there is obligation on either side, St Matthew is the borrower.

Turning now to St Luke's account, we find that his arrangement also is not that which an independent narrator would have been likely to adopt. We cannot

safely conclude that he was unacquainted with the story as St Mark tells it, though he does not speak of John's imprisonment without ever having formerly told of it; for this is an awkwardness which his literary skill would enable him to avoid. But if the other two Evangelists tell of John's imprisonment too late, St Luke does so too early, for he tells of it (iii. 20) before his account of our Lord's baptism, which must have taken place while John was still at liberty. Moreover, though he relates John's imprisonment, he does not tell of his death. If it had been St Luke's object to relate the history of John, I cannot but think that he would have arranged it more artistically; and I think the most natural explanation of the facts is that St Luke *was* acquainted with St Mark's account, which dated the call of the four Apostles as taking place after John's imprisonment, and that he therefore felt the literary necessity of telling about the imprisonment before relating the call of the Apostles; and that, having thus made use of that section of Mark which tells, out of chronological order, the story of the imprisonment and death of John, he did not observe that, though it would have been premature to tell of John's death in the place where he had told of the imprisonment, he was leaving the death of the Baptist altogether unrecorded; or he may have thought that an event which had no immediate bearing on the story he was telling might be passed over in silence.

There is an important difference between St Matthew and the other two Synoptics in their method of making reference to John's imprisonment. In Mark it is a mere note of time, indicating that what was next to be related took place after that occurrence; and with St Luke it is no more, for he thinks it unnecessary to mention the imprisonment here, having done so by anticipation already, and thereby sufficiently indicated the sequence of events. But St Matthew's account implies, though it does not actually say, that it was because Jesus heard

that John had been cast into prison that He departed into Galilee. We have not materials to determine whether St Matthew is here but cautiously indicating an inference of his own from St Mark's account, or whether he derived it from some other authority. It is not at first sight obvious that Jesus would have been less secure from molestation by Herod if He remained by the Jordan, than if He removed to Galilee, over which Herod was tetrarch. We shall presently have to consider (Mark iii. 7) another change in the sphere of our Lord's activity caused by the ill-will of the Herodian party. But we know too imperfectly the political relations of the time to have any right to charge St Matthew with error, if he had actually said that Jesus was in less danger from Herod in Galilee than by the Jordan.

In speaking of this removal, St Mark (iii. 7) uses the word ἀνεχώρησεν. If it be the case that St Matthew used St Mark's Gospel, we must admit the possibility that St Matthew's employment of the word here (iv. 12) instead of ἦλθεν (Mark i. 14) may have been suggested by St Mark's use of it on a similar occasion.

Here I shall take the liberty of interpolating a speculation of my own, which may be passed over by any reader who is impatient of any view which cannot be established by real evidence. St Mark, in his fourteenth verse, makes a transition from the story of the Temptation, which had been told by Q, to an account of our Lord's teaching which we may well believe was substantially the same as the report which St Peter gave in the Christian assemblies of what he had been taught by Jesus. That report naturally began with the relation how our Lord called on Peter to follow Him; and commenced with *Jesus came into Galilee*. But if we ask, When? no note of time is given, save that it was *after that John was delivered up*. It was natural to suppose that no great interval of time separated things told by St Mark in consecutive verses, and therefore to infer that the calling of the Apostles must almost

immediately have followed our Lord's temptation; but if we recognise that St Mark is using different authorities, we have no right to assume that the second begins at exactly the point of time at which the first ended. And it seems to me that we have no sufficient authority for believing that our Lord enlisted assistants in the work of announcing the coming Kingdom of God, without having made any attempt to do that work single-handed. It appears to me probable that our Lord had already become known both as a teacher and a worker of miracles before He called on Peter and the other disciples to give up their ordinary occupations, and become His followers and helpers.

There is a section of Q (Matt. xi. 20; Luke x. 13), which purports to report words spoken by our Lord at the time, according to St Luke, when He was sending out His disciples, two by two, to preach, in which *He began to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not* (Matt. xi. 20). This section begins *Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida!* We shall have occasion to speak of Bethsaida later on, but here it is enough to say that very little is told, under that name, in the Gospels, of our Lord's preaching in that city. It is only named in Mark vi. 45; viii. 22. Chorazin is not once named in the Gospel story of our Lord's mighty works. It seems strange, if our Lord had visited that town in the company of His disciples, that St Peter's reminiscences should have retained nothing of a city where some of his Master's most wonderful miracles are said to have been performed. But we must take into account the possibility that Chorazin may have been a centre of our Lord's work before the call of Peter, and that the unbelief which He encountered there was the cause of His not paying it a later visit. In Bethsaida He was more successful, at least if we accept the statement of St John's Gospel (i. 44; xii. 21), which may well have been founded on trustworthy tradition, that three of the Apostles (Andrew, Peter, and Philip) were

natives of that city, where they might have been witnesses of Christ's miracles. The account given both by St Luke and St Mark of His reception at Nazareth would lead us to think that He had been so long away that there had been time to forget His personal appearance, and make it possible for the inhabitants to question whether this teacher, who had obtained so much reputation elsewhere, were really their fellow-citizen. As we proceed, other indications will present themselves that our Lord's fame had spread abroad in Galilee before the calling of Peter. St Luke records (iv. 14), after the Temptation, that *Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee*, words which certainly imply that this return took place immediately after the Temptation. He adds that *a fame went out concerning Him through all the region round about. And He taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all*. It is not till the next chapter that we are told of the calling of Peter. Thus St Luke clearly favours the view that some period of single-handed preaching preceded the time when our Lord enlisted disciples to help Him in His work. It is during this interval that we must suppose the apprehension of the Baptist took place; and we need not wonder that it finds no place in our Lord's history.

MARK i. 14. ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

MATT. iv. 12. ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά ἐλθὼν κατώκησεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

I do not think we are bound to conclude that St Matthew means to represent our Lord as returning from the Jordan to Nazareth. St Mark does not state in what part of Galilee our Lord began His preaching. St Matthew had already (ii. 23) represented our Lord as settled in Nazareth; from this time he evidently regards our Lord as having His headquarters in Capernaum; and possibly in iv. 12 he means no more than to indicate this change of residence. Capernaum being on the borders of the

tribal possessions of Zebulun and Naphtali, St Matthew finds here a fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy (ix. 1). We need not suppose this prophetic prophecy to have been derived from Q. St Matthew's Gospel is full of references to the fulfilments of Old Testament prophecies in our Lord's life. If these had been found in Q, I do not think they could have been so entirely suppressed in the Gospels of St Mark and St Luke, who also used Q. No subject is more likely to have had a more prominent place in the weekly addresses in the Christian assemblies; and this topic was rapidly developed under the guidance of the first preachers of the Gospel. I therefore find it much easier to believe that St Matthew might have added illustrations of such fulfilments, which he had not found in a previous Gospel, than that St Mark and St Luke should have suppressed them if they had found them there.

MARK i. 14. κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Apart from the present text, the phrase *the Gospel of the Kingdom* is peculiar to St Matthew, who uses it three times (iv. 23; ix. 35; xxiv. 14). The first two of these can scarcely be counted as independent of each other, for they both seem to represent the same passage in Q. The phrase *Gospel of the Kingdom* concisely conveys the idea that the good news which Jesus and His forerunner proclaimed was the immediate coming of God's Kingdom. In the third passage where St Matthew has *the Gospel of the Kingdom* the corresponding passage of Mark has simply *the Gospel*. In the present passage, seeing that there is every reason to suppose that it represents a passage in Q where the phrase *the Gospel of the Kingdom* was used, that the phrase is particularly appropriate here, where it is in immediate conjunction with the announcement that the Kingdom of God was at hand, and that we have seen reason to believe that St Mark was acquainted with Q, we might be tempted to pronounce that *the Gospel of the Kingdom* was the original text of Mark. But the reasons just

given are also reasons why the phrase might naturally have found its way here even if it had not been used by St Mark. I am inclined to pronounce that the phrase *Gospel of the Kingdom* belongs to a date earlier than St Mark, when the word *Gospel* would not be used without explanation what the good news was; and that in this place, as in xiii. 10, St Mark substitutes for the language of Q, the simple phrase *the Gospel*, which then needed no explanation. I must say however that I cannot help feeling that in Westcott and Hort's attempt to recover the *original autograph* of the Gospels they have too much left out of sight the possibility that in the weekly Church recitations of the Gospel history verbal changes may have crept in before the story came to be written down.

THE CALLING OF PETER, AND ANDREW, JAMES, AND JOHN

MARK i. 16-20.

Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος ἀμφιβάλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλεῖς· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλεῖς ἀνθρώπων. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Καὶ προβὰς ὀλίγον εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς. καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαῖον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθῶν ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ.

MATT. iv. 18-22.

Περιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν δύο ἀδελφούς, Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλεῖς· καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἁλεῖς ἀνθρώπων. οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Καὶ προβὰς ἐκείθεν εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ Ζεβεδαίου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς. οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὸ πλοῖον καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

LUKE v. 1-11.

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ, καὶ εἶδεν πλοῖα δύο ἐστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην, οἱ δὲ ἁλεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες ἐπλυνον τὰ δίκτυα. ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων, ὃ ἦν Σίμωνος, ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν

ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπαναγαγεῖν ὀλίγον, καθίσας δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου
 ἐδίδασκεν τοὺς ὄχλους. . . . ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ
 Ἰωάννην υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, οἳ ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. καὶ
 εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν
 ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν· καὶ καταγαγόντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐπὶ
 τὴν γῆν ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

On comparing the accounts of St Mark and St Matthew we find so many points of agreement, not merely in the substance of the narrative, but in forms of expression, that it is impossible to believe the accounts to be independent of each other. They agree in telling that as Jesus was walking by *the sea of Galilee* He saw first Simon and his brother Andrew casting a net into the sea *for they were fishers*. Even without going further, we can hardly conceive two independent writers making the addition of the last four words. St Matthew and St Mark agree in calling this lake *the sea of Galilee*. St Luke only applies the name θάλασσα to the real sea, and calls this lake ἡ λίμνη Γεννησαρέτ. St John (vi. i.) retains the name *sea of Galilee*, but calls it also by the name, not *Gennesaret*, but of *Tiberias*. As we shall afterwards find that St John used St Luke's Gospel, this variation from Luke's nomenclature seems to imply local knowledge. St Matthew's mention of Zebedee, as in the boat with his sons, tells nothing that he might not have learnt from Mark, but St Mark's mention of *the hired servants* could not have been derived from anything stated by St Matthew.

We must now say a few words about the differences between Matthew and Mark, which are not more than generally occur when one relates a story which he has learnt from another. The first, however, seems to indicate that the two Evangelists had a different conception of the situation. Instead of St Mark's παράγων, St Matthew has περιπατῶν. St Matthew (iv. 13) regards our Lord as settled in Capernaum, a town on the lake (τὴν παραθαλασσίαν), and supposes Him to have seen Peter when taking a walk by the lake. St Mark, who has not named any particular town as the place of our Lord's sojourn, seems to regard the meeting as taking place

when our Lord was making one of His missionary journeys round τὴν θάλασσαν.

This difference would lead us to think that St Matthew is not borrowing directly from Mark, but that the relation between them is rather that both are using a common authority. And this conclusion is confirmed by what we have already noticed, the difference between the orderly disposition of St Mark's narrative and the looser connexion of St Matthew's, which seems to be founded on a collection of unconnected anecdotes. That St Mark's is intended for continuous history appears from the fact that, while St Matthew describes the disciple whom Jesus called on this occasion as *Simon who is called Peter*, St Mark all through this chapter only calls him *Simon*, in accordance with historical propriety; for we know otherwise that it was at a later period that Simon received the name *Peter* from his Master (Matt. xvi. 18; Mark iii. 16; John i. 42). Of course different attention would be paid to a point of this kind by one who was telling an isolated anecdote, and by one whose purpose was to tell a complete history. St Luke, telling in a different way the story of this disciple's call (v. 1-11), uses the name *Simon*, save that once (v. 8) the subsequently familiar name *Peter* slips out. In the Acts likewise, St Luke is careful to use the Jewish name of the Apostle of the Gentiles all through the earlier history, and not to employ the Latin name *Paul*, which ultimately displaced the older appellation, until the Apostle comes into contact with a Roman Governor.

It is no proof that St Matthew is not copying Mark, that in place of St Mark's concise phrase ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ St Matthew has ἀμφίβληστρον. It would be an improvement in the interests of greater intelligibility, even if St Matthew was copying Mark, but it may just as well have arisen from two independent reproductions of the same original. A suspicion of St Matthew's indebtedness to Mark arises from the common use of the expression

εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ ὀκτυα. We need not trouble ourselves about the difference that St Matthew ordinarily has the form εὐθέως, where the older copies of Mark have εὐθύς.

Although I believe that the authority which St Matthew was here using was Q, I do not mean to dispute that St Matthew was acquainted with Mark, and might have caught from him some of his favourite formulæ. How else are we to explain that immediately afterwards, in speaking of the call of the sons of Zebedee, St Matthew uses a εὐθέως which he certainly did not find in Mark, οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὸ πλοῖον καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν? Now it is evident that whether St Matthew and St Luke used St Mark's Gospel or not, they had other sources of information. And on the hypothesis that they did use Mark, it was to be expected that when they had to introduce matter derived from a different source they would be obliged to abridge or make selections from that derived from Mark; and also that if they had been following St Mark's order, their doing so would be interrupted when they introduced extraneous matter.

It seems to me that there is good reason for thinking that just at this place St Matthew passes from the use of one authority to another. He has just told the story of the call of the Apostles, which, as I believe, he might have found in Q as well as in Mark; and he is about to introduce a long section to which Mark has nothing corresponding, namely, that which reports the Sermon on the Mount, taking three whole chapters, followed by the account of the healing of the centurion's servant, which, though not recorded by St Mark, is told by St Luke, and therefore may be probably referred to Q as its authority. But here St Matthew, before parting with Mark, gives in the last three verses of his fourth chapter an account in general terms, almost in the very words of Mark iii. 7, 8, of our Lord's preaching in Galilee. And here it is to be noted that St Matthew repeats in ix. 35, in almost identical words, the verse iv. 23.

We turn now to compare Mark with Luke, and we find that, with the exception of one great divergence, St Luke in this part of his work follows Mark more closely than St Matthew has done.

With regard to the change of the place where the calling of Peter is related, it is a sufficient explanation that St Luke had obtained from a source which he regarded as trustworthy an account which connected the call of Peter with a miraculous draught of fishes, of which that disciple was a witness; and St Luke's account is by no means contradictory of St Mark's, to which it may rather be regarded as supplemental. St Luke does not represent Peter as owing his first knowledge of our Lord to this miracle; on the contrary, he tells first of the entry of Jesus into Peter's house, and the healing of his wife's mother; he tells of our Lord's use of Peter's boat, in order to escape the pressure of the multitude; and he relates also how, at a word from Jesus, Peter let down his net, though it is not to be supposed that if the word had been spoken by an entire stranger, the fishermen would have consented to prolong their fruitless toil. In fact Peter's discipleship had evidently different stages of intimacy with our Lord. First we know of Peter as a disciple of the Baptist, but taught by his master to recognise Jesus as his destined successor. We find him, after John's imprisonment, formally enlisted, as St Mark tells, as a disciple of our Lord. Then follows a stage when he became our Lord's constant companion, going about with Him in His tours of preaching, placing, as it would seem, his boat at his Master's disposal, whether for visiting different villages on the lake, or as affording a place for preaching secure from the pressure of the crowd; and, when well instructed in our Lord's doctrines, going about as His envoy or missionary to make known the glad tidings to villages which Jesus Himself had not visited. We could not tell from St Mark's brief narrative whether this missionary work began immediately on Peter's professed discipleship, which that Evangelist records, or whether

there may not have been a subsequent call to closer partnership, such as St Luke records. We are therefore not bound to regard St Luke's account as contradictory to that given by St Mark; and we are not concerned to discuss whether ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλλεῖς ἀνθρώπων, and, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν are to be regarded as words spoken by our Lord on two different occasions, or as two reports, different in form, but substantially identical, of the same utterance. On the whole I see no reason to doubt that St Luke used St Mark's Gospel as his authority, though he modified the first sections in accordance with other information which he had received, and which he accounted trustworthy.

THE SYNAGOGUE OF CAPERNAUM.

MARK i. 21a.

Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

LUKE iv. 31a.

Καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

I follow now St Mark's order, accounting him to be the original authority for what is told in the rest of this chapter.

St Luke's explanation that Capernaum was a city of Galilee would need no comment (since the name occurs in a work intended for readers unacquainted with the locality), if the explanation had been given the first time the city was mentioned. But actually he had already introduced the name of the city, without explanation (iv. 23). This becomes quite intelligible when it is acknowledged that the report of the sermon at Nazareth comes from a source different from that from which the narrative that follows it is derived, and that the latter narrative bears internal marks of dealing with events earlier in date than the visit to Nazareth. See p. 73.

MARK i. 21b.

Καὶ εὐθύς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν
εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.

LUKE iv. 31b.

Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς
σάββασιν.

It is certainly true that τὰ σάββατα may be used when only one Sabbath is spoken of. Thus, Exod. xvi. 25, 26: ἔστιν γὰρ σάββατα σήμερον τῇ κυρίῳ, οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ. ἐξ ἡμέρας συλλέξετε τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατα; but I see no reason for understanding St Mark's statement in any other than the obvious sense that our Lord at once on His arrival commenced the practice of teaching in the synagogue every Sabbath day. The ἦν διδάσκων of St Mark's next verse evidently describes the impression produced by our Lord's habitual mode of teaching. It is true that the εὐθύς of Mark i. 23 suggests that the healing of the demoniac took place on the first Sabbath that our Lord attended the synagogue, and that He left Capernaum next morning. But since we find that He soon returned to that city, His general practice of preaching in the synagogue might well be mentioned here. It may be added that there is no evidence that the visit to the synagogue which St Mark relates was our Lord's first visit. He may have included Capernaum in His missionary circuits before He enlisted Peter as His assistant. Before St Luke tells of our Lord's visit to Nazareth, he had recorded our Lord's custom of preaching in the Galilean synagogues, Ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν (Luke iv. 15). And St Luke evidently understood St Mark to speak of our Lord's habitual practice, for in verse 31 he substitutes for St Mark's ἐδίδασκεν, ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν.

MARK i. 22.

Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

MATT. vii. 28, 29.

Ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.

LUKE iv. 32.

Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

It is impossible to read these words of the three Evangelists without feeling that all three represent one

original. The closest resemblance is between St Matthew's version and St Mark's, which are almost identical, save that where St Mark says *not as the scribes*, St Matthew says *not as their scribes*. We might be inclined to regard this as a mark of posteriority, as indicating a time when the separation between the Christian community and the Jewish had become so marked, that, in speaking of the scribes, it was felt necessary to explain that it was the Jewish scribes that were intended. However this may be, we are well disposed to accept the connexion in which St Matthew places this remark. He introduces it at the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount; and there seems much appropriateness in noticing there the independent character of our Lord's mode of teaching. He did not found His instruction on any external authority, *This was the opinion of such a rabbi, that of such another rabbi*; on the contrary, He freely disregarded the *dicta* of previous teachers: *Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you*. Our first impression therefore would certainly be that St Matthew does not here copy Mark, but found this remark appended to the Sermon on the Mount in Q, or whatever document from which he drew his report of that Sermon, and that St Mark took the remark from the same source, finding it equally applicable to the teaching in the Galilean synagogues which he himself describes.

The questions, however, raised by a comparison of St Mark's report with St Matthew's are much less important than those that arise on a comparison with St Luke's, which affect our interpretation of the saying that our Lord *taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes*; for I find no trace that St Luke understood the passage as we do. I cannot doubt that we have been rightly taught by St Matthew to connect this remark with the independence of other teachers which our Lord exhibited, when, on His own authority, He extended the range of the precepts of old time. But

in St Luke's report we find ἐξουσία attributed to our Lord in His character, not of a teacher, but of an exorciser of demons. He seems to have in view, not the authority which our Lord exercised over the hearers, who were bound meekly to receive His instructions, but over the demons who were compelled to obey the commands which He had power to enforce, authority which He not only possessed Himself (Luke iv. 36), but was able to confer on His disciples (Luke ix. 1 ; x. 19). In the present passage, St Luke makes no comparison with the teaching of the scribes, but merely observes that our Lord's *word was with authority* ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. He goes on to relate His casting out the demon in the synagogue, and tells of the impression made on the spectators of the miracle ; ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν, καὶ ἐξέρχονται. If this was the sense which the word ἐξουσία chiefly conveyed to St Luke, it is intelligible that he should not mention the scribes, who never claimed such authority. But we shall not wonder at the view taken by St Luke, if we admit that in this narrative he is entirely dependent on St Mark's authority. For, if we ourselves had no other Gospel than St Mark's, who does not in this place relate any discourse of our Lord's, and does not, like St Matthew, place the remark about our Lord's ἐξουσία in immediate collocation with an exhibition of the independence of His teaching, I do not think we should have connected the two ; and St Mark's Gospel had given sufficient reason for applying the word ἐξουσία to the power of commanding demons. In Mark iii. 15 we are told that our Lord chose twelve that He might send them κηρύσσειν καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια ; and afterwards (vi. 7) when St Mark comes to relate the actual sending out of the Twelve, he says : ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων. I do not care to discuss whether St Luke's way of understanding the remark we are discussing is not more in accordance with St Mark's intention than the interpretation we

ourselves give it. It is true that St Matthew's account fixes attention chiefly on the authority by which our Lord claimed submission from His hearers, and St Luke's on that which He exercised over demons; but it may well be believed that St Mark had both in view; for the one authority was the foundation of the other. If a new and unknown teacher had ventured to criticise, and to issue in a new form, precepts the antiquity of which he could not dispute, his audience would have resented the arrogance of such pretension; but it was submitted to, because Jesus was able to show in their presence that He had authority over demons, who were forced to obey His commands. As far as Capernaum was concerned, this would seem to have been our Lord's beginning of miracles. At least it may have been the first performed with such publicity as to attract general attention.

To my explanation that St Luke only knew of the remark about our Lord's teaching *ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων* through having read it in St Mark's Gospel, which does not connect it with any discourse of our Lord, it may be suggested in answer, that though St Luke does not appear to have known our First Gospel, he was certainly acquainted with its source Q, to which the First Evangelist was most probably indebted for his report of the Sermon on the Mount, as well as for the remark appended to it. The force of this objection, however, would depend very much on our answer to the question, In what way are we to suppose that St Luke knew the source Q? If he knew it as a document, the objection holds good, but I shall afterwards have occasion to discuss the question whether it may not be that St Luke knew Q, not in a written form, but through having heard sections of it read out in the Church service, an idea suggested to me by the differences between St Matthew's and St Luke's reports of the Sermon on the Mount. If it was only thus, through isolated sections, that St Luke knew Q, we need not wonder at his usually coinciding with

St Mark as to the order of narration, seeing that on this point he had no other guidance; nor need we have recourse to any other theory to account for St Luke's seeming unacquaintance with the links, which may, in Q, have joined one anecdote to another. See p. 123.

THE MIRACLE IN THE SYNAGOGUE OF CAPERNAUM

We come now to examine in more detail the two accounts of the miracle in the synagogue; for, as already remarked, St Matthew does not mention it, and we have only Mark and Luke to compare. The silence of St Matthew can best be explained by his regarding this as one of many anecdotes of our Lord, some of which brevity compelled him to omit; and we have no reason to suppose that St Matthew attached the importance to this miracle which St Mark's account leads us to ascribe to it, as the first public manifestation of our Lord's miraculous power. We find the two accounts in complete agreement, not only as to the order of arrangement, but in the use of the same words. None of the differences is such as to afford proof that St Luke was drawing from any source but Mark.

MARK i. 23.

Καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν
ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ
ἀνέκραξεν λέγων

LUKE iv. 33.

Καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος
ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου, καὶ
ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ

St Luke's omission of the *εὐθύς* is natural, because he is relating an isolated story, and not, as in St Mark's case, one in close connexion with what precedes. The difference between St Luke's object and St Mark's is apparent from the fact that though they agree in saying that the miracle about to be related was

performed in the synagogue, St Mark, as relating a continuous narrative, first tells of our Lord's entrance into the synagogue; but St Luke gives no explanation how he came to be there.

MARK i. 24.

[*Ἔα*], τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζα-
ρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά
σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

LUKE iv. 34.

Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζα-
ρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε
τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

According to Westcott and Hort's text the word *ἔα* belongs to the genuine text of Luke, but not of Mark. Yet if the conclusion is right, at which I have already arrived, and of which we shall find much confirmatory evidence as we go along, viz., that St Luke derived many narratives from Mark, in that case St Luke is the earliest witness to St Mark's text; and in judging between two readings, one agreeing with Luke, and the other not, in place of holding that St Mark's text has been corrupted by assimilation with St Luke's, we ought to prefer the reading of Mark which St Luke has followed, unless there is reason to suspect the latter Evangelist of designed alteration.

In the present case, where it is supposed that St Luke added something which he did not derive from Mark, the question arises, Did he draw it from an independent source? or is it an addition of his own? Our decision of this question affects a question of interpretation. We may understand *ἔα* as a simple interjection, the interpretation preferred by the translators of the R. V., who render it *Ah*! The word *ἔα* is used as an expression of surprise or displeasure by Æschylus, Plato, and others, but it is not so used elsewhere in the N. T., nor in the LXX, except in the translation of the book of Job, where it occurs four times. The idea is that it is here used to express phonetically the harsh cry of the demoniac. This explanation might be satisfactory, if it had been the case that it was St Mark that recorded, and St Luke that omitted, this interjection. It might have been natural, in one who had been present in the synagogue, in relating the incident, to attempt to

reproduce the sound which he had heard, and equally natural in one who afterwards repeated the story to omit what might seem either unintelligible or unnecessary. I find no trace that St Luke is here using any authority but Mark; and I do not think it in St Luke's manner to interpolate such an interjection without authority, merely to make his narrative dramatically more effective. I consider, therefore, that to interpret *ěa* as a mere interjection is inconsistent with the supposition that this word is an addition made by St Luke to a story derived from Mark.

We must fall back then on the interpretation adopted in the A. V., which renders the word *Let us alone*, the demon's petition thus being that he should be left undisturbed. The idea comes out more clearly in the subsequent story of the man who had the Legion (Mark v. 7, 8), that to dispossess the demon and send him down to the abyss was, as St Matthew has it, *πρὸ καιροῦ βασίλειαι*, a phrase which certainly implies a theory that the demons were allowed to go about the earth only for a limited period, which had not then expired, so that they felt that they had a right to complain if their appointed term were cut short, and to demand that they should not be meddled with. I should, therefore, feel no difficulty in thus explaining *ěa*, if it had been the reading of Mark; but it seems to me that if it was St Luke who was importing from another story into this narrative an idea not found here in his original, he would have expressed it more fully, and not have left it to be gathered from a doubtful interpretation of a single word.

I feel myself, therefore, driven to re-examine the evidence for the statement that *ěa* belongs to the genuine text of Luke, but not of Mark. In both cases the evidence for the word is of great antiquity and of attestation widely spread geographically. The only important difference is that in Mark the word is omitted by B and its usual followers, but not in Luke. If it be asked, why then did B not also omit it in St Luke's Gospel?

I answer that we have no right to assume that the conditions of transmission of the two Gospels were the same. It seems to me probable that the parent of B's text of St Mark's Gospel was a document containing that Gospel alone, and not in company with other Gospels.

The phrase $\tau\acute{\iota} \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\acute{o}\iota$ comes from the LXX, where it is a literal translation of a Hebrew phrase. We may as well translate, *What hast thou to do with me?* as *What have I to do with thee?* both being included in the question, *What have we in common?* but in some places the former is the more appropriate rendering, when the idea intended to be conveyed is *Why do you meddle with me?*

In the present case a question arises as to the use of the plural $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$. It is appropriate, as used in Matthew viii. 29, because it is there said to be spoken by two demoniacs; but it is strange that in the passage of Mark (v. 7) which corresponds to this verse of Matthew, although a man possessed by a legion of devils is the speaker, he only says $\tau\acute{\iota} \epsilon\mu\acute{o}\iota$. St Luke agrees with St Mark in using here the plural number in the case of a man possessed by a single demon, and afterwards (Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28), the singular number in the case of a man possessed by many. This coincidence is one of many which forbid us to believe the two accounts to be independent. The obvious explanation of the use of the plural number is that the man means to say *Why do you meddle with us demons?* It would follow that he knew that his was no isolated case, and that our Lord had cast out other demons too; but I see no reason to think it impossible that he might have had this knowledge.

Ιησοῦ Ναζαρηέ. —St Mark uses the form Ναζαρηός three times, and no other. St Luke has the form Ναζωρᾶνος eight times in the Acts, and there never Ναζαρηός . He has Ναζωρᾶνος also in the Gospel (Luke xviii. 37). Beside the present place, the form Ναζαρηός is found in Luke, only in xxiv. 19, at least according

to the oldest MSS., though there a majority read *Ναζωραῖος*. On account of this instance, the occurrence of *Ναζαρηνός* in the present verse does not amount to a proof that St Luke is here copying Mark, though that supposition best explains St Luke's deviation here from his usual practice.

MARK i. 25.

Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
[λέγων], Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

LUKE iv. 35a.

Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
λέγων, Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

We have here Luke in almost verbal identity with Mark. It is true that *λέγων* in Mark is omitted by Tischendorf, and bracketted by W. H.; but there is not sufficient reason for questioning the genuineness of the word. It is found in B; and though it was omitted by the actual scribe of *8*, the omission was corrected by the *διορθωτής*. St Mark elsewhere does not content himself with *ἐπετίμησεν*, without adding *λέγων*, when the words of the rebuke are given (see viii. 33; ix. 25). But for *ἔξελθε ἐξ*, a kind of duplication to which St Mark shows in other places that he has no objection, St Luke, as he usually does in such cases, substitutes *ἔξελθε ἀπό*.

MARK i. 26.

Καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ
ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ
ἔξῃλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

LUKE iv. 35b.

Καὶ ῥίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ
μέσον ἔξῃλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν
αὐτόν.

This is the only verse where St Luke seems to add anything to the narrative of St Mark, with which in other points he is in such close verbal coincidence. Yet the variations here may be regarded as mere literary corrections, and do not necessarily imply the use of an independent authority. With respect to the substitution of *ῥίψαν* for *σπαράξαν*, it must be remembered that *σπαράσσω* is an exceedingly strong word, ordinarily meaning *to rend in pieces*. It occurs no where else in the N. T., save that St Mark uses it (ix. 20, *συσπαράσσω*, 26) in relating the more troublesome cure of another demoniac, and that St Luke, in his parallel passage (ix. 42) employs the word *συσπαράσσω*, but is careful to

employ it only with respect to what took place before our Lord commanded the demon to depart. In the present case, St Mark's description of the convulsive movements which preceded the cure would be likely to convey to one who knew no other account the impression that the demon on his departure violently tore, and permanently injured, the tenement from which he was being evicted. St Luke substitutes here for St Mark's word, *tearing him, thrown him down in the midst*, and is careful to add that the demon, in departing, did the man no hurt. For myself, I have no doubt that this change was made by one who having found in his authority the word *σπυράσσω*, wished to exclude the impression which that word might convey. But this at least I count certain, that if there was any relation of copying between St Mark and St Luke, St Mark could not have been the copier. We cannot imagine that any disciple of our Lord, who had read in his authority that his Master had restored a demoniac to health, uninjured by the visitation, should not only omit the assurance that no permanent harm had been done, but should gratuitously so strengthen the language of his authority as to convey quite the contrary impression.

THE EFFECT OF THE MIRACLE

MARK i. 27a.

Καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες, ὥστε
συνζητεῖν αὐτοὺς λέγοντας

MARK i. 27b (*Oldest Copies*),
Tischendorf's punctuation.

Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ'
ἐξουσίαν, καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκα-
θάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν
αὐτῷ.

LUKE iv. 36a.

Καὶ ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ
συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες

MARK i. 27b (*Text. Recept.*).

Τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη, ὅτι κατ'
ἐξουσίαν, κ.τ.λ.

LUKE iv. 36b.

Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει
τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν, καὶ ἐξέρχονται.

These verses have been already commented on (p. 91), with the result that in my judgment the

difference between Mark and Luke is not such as to justify the opinion that St Luke used an independent authority.

It is not without some hesitation that I adopt in Mark the reading of the oldest copies. Luke seems in closer relation with the later MSS. I own also that I do not quite understand the *καὶ* before *τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις*. I quite understand that those who had seen our Lord's power to command demons should be surprised at His power also to command the winds and the sea (Mark iv. 41); but it seems to me that it was over demons our Lord's power was first manifested.

MARK i. 28.

Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περιχώρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

LUKE iv. 37.

Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο ἡχος περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου.

The only difference here that is not merely verbal is that St Luke does not mention Galilee; but he had previously done so in verse 14 of this chapter, a verse which seems to have been suggested by the verse of Mark now under consideration.

LUKE iv. 14.

Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ φήμῃ ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.

PETER'S WIFE'S MOTHER

MARK i. 29.

Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξεληθόντες ἦλθαν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.

MATT. viii. 14a.

Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου

LUKE iv. 38a.

Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος.

Here St Mark makes the visit to Peter's house take place immediately on our Lord's coming out of the synagogue. St Matthew disregards this connexion, but St Luke conveys the same idea, though he avoids

the use of the word εὐθὺς. He also corrects St Mark's inelegant ἐξελθὼν ἡλθεν (B) into ἀναστὰς . . . εἰσῆλθεν. The simplest explanation seems to me that the story had been told in Q as an isolated anecdote, which St Mark, under St Peter's instruction, has placed in its proper setting, and that St Luke has copied Mark. St Mark alone tells that the house was Andrew's as well as Peter's, and that the two sons of Zebedee entered with our Lord. It has been noticed already (p. 85), that St Mark only gives the Apostle the name Simon, until he formally relates (iii. 16) that our Lord surnamed him Peter, after which in his narrative the Evangelist drops the name of Simon. St Matthew, in his first mention of the Apostle (iv. 18), designates him as *Simon who is called Peter*; and thus is able in relating this story to give him no other name than Peter. St Luke's vacillation on this point marks the diversity of the sources which he employed. He had not mentioned, under any name, this disciple as being in our Lord's company until (iv. 38) he gives St Mark's version of the present story and calls him by St Mark's name, Simon.

MARK i. 30, 31.

Ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα, καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς· καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.

MATT. viii. 14b, 15.

Εἶδεν τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν· καὶ ἤψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός, καὶ ἠγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ.

LUKE iv. 38b, 39.

Πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ, καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπέτιμυσεν τῷ πυρετῷ, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν· παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστὰσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.

St Matthew makes our Lord, on coming in, *see* the sick person; according to the other two authorities He has to be told of her; and it seems altogether more probable that she was lying in a different room from that which was first entered, and in which the meal was to take place. St Mark only relates that they *told* our Lord of her; St Luke's word *asked* implies that they requested Him to heal her. Yet the narrative does not tell us that the disciples had previous experience of our Lord's power to heal sickness, though they knew of His

authority to command demons. St Luke's phrase, however, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ, would seem to indicate that he regarded the disease as caused by the working of a malignant spiritual being. We have a parallel, however, to our Lord's rebuking the fever in what St Mark tells us of His rebuking the wind (iv. 39).

The mention of the woman waiting on the guests reveals what otherwise might escape notice, that Jesus entered Peter's house because invited to a meal; and we get the explanation why James and John came in too, to take part in the entertainment. It was, in short, what answered to our "Sunday dinner"; for Josephus tells us that it was customary among the Jews to have a dinner-party on the Sabbath. Ἐκτῇ ὥρᾳ καθ' ἣν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀριστοποιεῖσθαι νόμιμόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν (Josephus, *Vit.* 54, cited by Swete *in loc.*).

St Matthew seems to have regarded our Lord as at the time residing in Capernaum; but this does not appear to have been the view of St Mark or St Luke. Nor do I suppose that our Lord had any fixed residence, for He said Himself, *The Son of man hath not where to lay his head*. But He no doubt did Himself as He directed His apostles to do, and accepted such hospitality as He was offered in each town He visited, on the principle that *The labourer is worthy of his hire*. It would appear from what follows that on this occasion He slept at Simon's house, but He probably had not slept there the night before, as in that case He would not have needed to be told of the illness of one of the inmates of the house.

It has to be noted that St Matthew, who has not told of the coming in of other disciples, has διηκόνει αὐτῷ, instead of αὐτοῖς. St Luke follows St Mark in his use of the plural number, though he does not give the explanation why it should be used. St Matthew has nothing corresponding to St Mark's προσελθόν, or St Luke's ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς, which is accounted for if St Matthew did not regard the invalid as being in a different room.

St Luke alone tells that the disease by which this woman was affected was a *great* fever, πυρετῶ μεγάλῳ; and the question has been asked, whether he had any authority for making this addition, or whether he did it out of his own head. I do not myself think it likely that St Luke had any authority but the two of which we know already, Q and Mark; nor do I suppose he could have had any better. Wetstein quotes Galen (*De different. febr.*) as telling that physicians counted two kinds of fever: τὸν μέγαν and τὸν μικρόν; and possibly there may be something in the suggestion that St Luke, as a physician, did not like to speak of a fever without specifying to which class it belonged.

Perhaps it is a more important change that while St Matthew and St Mark tell that our Lord took the sick woman by the hand, St Luke does not mention this, but only tells that He stood over her and rebuked the fever. I do not know whether it was less of a miracle that water flowed when Moses struck the rock, or that it should flow when Moses only spoke to it. Those who are anxious (as I am not) to eliminate miracle from the story might receive St Mark's account without admitting that any miracle had taken place. The sick woman had had a feverish attack, and was lying down; she is told that the great prophet who had just cast out a demon in the synagogue was come into the house; He comes in to her, takes her by the hand, and bids her get up; she obeys, and finds that she is really well enough to preside over the hospitalities of the visit. Whether we admit or not that there was anything miraculous in this, we need not doubt that those who told the story (including St Mark himself) believed that a miracle had taken place. St Mark, however, tells what actually took place; those who repeated the story, including those perhaps from whom St Luke heard it, may have told it in the way that it seemed to them natural that the miracle ought to have been worked, a matter concerning which it is not uncommon that men should have preconceived ideas

(see 2 Kings v. 11). Those, however, to whom it is repugnant to believe that there can be the smallest inaccuracy in a Gospel statement can have no difficulty in combining the two accounts, and believing that our Lord both took the woman by the hand, as related by St Matthew and St Mark, and that He spoke to the fever, as St Luke tells.

THE CROWD ROUND THE DOOR IN THE EVENING

MARK i. 32-34.

Ὁ ψίλας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους· καὶ ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν. καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις, καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν, καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ᾗδειςαν αὐτὸν [Χριστὸν εἶναι].

MATT. viii. 16.

Ὁ ψίλας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ διαμονιζομένους πολλοὺς· καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν.

LUKE iv. 40, 41.

Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενούντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ ἐν ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς. ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν, κράζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾗδειςαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.

The impression produced by our Lord's miracle in the synagogue, and probably also by what was noised abroad by the healing of Peter's wife's mother, was so great that in the evening there was a crowd of people about the door. St Mark's expression that *all the city was gathered together* there seems to express the vivid recollection of an eye-witness, for the phrase is not preserved by St Matthew or St Luke.

St Mark says that the sick people were brought *at even, when the sun did set*; and as the day was the Sabbath, we can understand that it was not till the Sabbath was brought to a close by sunset that the labour of transporting the sick people could be undertaken. St Mark's *at even, when the sun did set* is not really pleonastic. It tells not only that the time was

evening, but which part of the evening it was. The sick people began to be brought only when the Sabbath was over. St Matthew has only *ὀψίας γενομένης*, probably all that was contained in Q, which St Matthew copied, and St Mark made more definite. There is, however, a complete parallel to this double dating in Mark xvi. 2, *very early . . . when the sun was risen*. Moreover the next verse appears to indicate a use of Mark by St Matthew; for phrases used by St Mark in this verse (34), in reference to what took place on the evening of the day of which he has so much to tell, are repeated by St Matthew (iv. 24) in his general account of our Lord's preaching, *Καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις*.

Though St Matthew mentions *the evening*, yet as he has not related the miracle in the synagogue, he gives no hint that the day was the Sabbath. St Luke does not call attention to this fact. He leaves out the phrase *ὀψίας γενομένης*: it may be to correct a seeming pleonasm; but it may be noted that while St Mark has the phrase *ὀψίας γενομένης* five times, the word *ὀψίας* is not used by St Luke either in Gospel or Acts. Here instead of it, St Luke alters St Mark's *ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος* into *δύνωντος τοῦ ἡλίου*, seemingly being unconscious of the reason why the setting of the sun was mentioned.

In the verses now under consideration, though there is some diversity between St Mark's narrative and those of the other two Evangelists, yet there is nothing to contradict, and a good deal to confirm, the hypothesis suggested by other considerations that these two Evangelists used Mark as their authority. In St Luke's case, note, for example, how St Mark's *ποικίλαις νόσοις* is brought in, though not exactly in the same place. Stylistic reasons afford quite sufficient explanation why St Luke should vary from St Mark's language. I frankly confess that there present themselves cases when St Mark's homeliness of style is more agreeable to modern taste than St Luke's careful compliance with rules laid down by the grammatical teachers approved

in his day. For example, St Luke might easily consider that he was making a literary improvement when instead of St Mark's vague *they*, in *they brought unto him all that were sick*, he wrote, *all they that had any sick . . . brought them unto him*; or when he corrected St Mark's use of the imperfect tense. In order to present to an English reader this peculiarity of St Mark's style, we might almost be driven to use the Irish frequentative *do be*. If an English historian found a statement *they did be bringing sick people to him*, it would seem an obvious improvement to reproduce it in the form *they brought*; and yet there would be some loss of vividness, and a missing of the point that what was related was, not a single attack, but a continuous series of applications for relief. In passages common to the three Evangelists, St Matthew generally agrees with St Luke in using the aorist, rather than St Mark's imperfect (here *e.g.* Matthew has *προσήνεγκαν*, and Luke *ἤγαγον* for Mark's *ἔφερον*), but there are exceptions, and there are even cases, when in passages common only to Matthew and Luke, St Matthew uses the aorist and St Luke the imperfect.

St Luke (iv. 41) has stated what was probably true, but what goes beyond what he might have found in Mark, who says (i. 34), that Jesus *suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him*. St Luke (iv. 41), enlarges this into *Devils also came out from many, crying out, and saying, Thou art the Son of God. And rebuking them, he suffered them not to speak, because they knew that he was the Christ*. If we are content with believing that St Luke used his authority as an honest historian might, he only draws from St Mark's words the inference that would be made from them by any modern commentator. St Mark had told (i. 25), how our Lord silenced the demoniac in the synagogue who bore witness, *I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God*, and again (iii. 11) how when *unclean spirits . . . fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God . . . he charged them much that they should not make him known*. St

Luke himself had experience at Philippi how the Apostle Paul had silenced a demoniac who bore witness to his divine commission (Acts xvi. 17); so that the only thing that it can be said that St Luke added here on his own authority is that the words of attestation were *Thou art the Son of God*, or, *the Christ*. We need not wonder that Jesus refused to receive testimony from so discreditable a source. Indeed if we bear in mind what we are told a little further on, of the theory put forward by the Jewish rulers that Jesus Himself was possessed by a demon, and that the chief of all the demons, not much regard would be paid to testimony borne by one demon to another, and that other the chief, whom he was bound to obey.

JESUS LEAVES CAPERNAUM

MARK i. 35-38.

Καὶ πρῶτὴ ἐννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξ-
ῆλθεν [καὶ ἀπῆλθεν] εἰς ἔρημον τόπον
κάκεϊ προσήχθεο. καὶ κατεδίωξεν
αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ
εὔρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι,
Πάντες ζητοῦσιν σε, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς,
Ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας
κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω, εἰς
τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον.

LUKE iv. 42, 43.

Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἐξελθὼν ἐπο-
ρεύθη εἰς ἔρημον τόπον· καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι
ἐπεξήτουν αὐτόν, καὶ ἦλθον ἕως αὐτοῦ,
καὶ κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι
ἀπ' αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς
ὅτι, Καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγ-
γελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ
θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην.

St Luke retains the εἰς ἔρημον τόπον of the first of these verses of Mark; his taste disapproves of St Mark's ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν, and he corrects the phrase into ἐξέλθων ἐπορεύθη. He does not care to preserve St Mark's forcible πρῶτὴ ἐννυχα λίαν, and he reserves for a later narrative the mention of our Lord's solitary prayers. From St Mark's next verse, St Luke much softens down the κατεδίωξεν in which St Mark has described the pursuit of our Lord. But the most important difference is that while St Mark describes

those who pursued after Him as Simon and his company, Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, St Luke appears to have understood from this phrase that the crowds who had gathered round Simon's house followed in the search. But St Mark's narrative inclines us rather to think that by οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ are meant Andrew, James, and John; for St Mark reports our Lord's answer when urged to return, not, *I must go to preach to other cities*, but ἄγωμεν (see Matt. xxvi. 46; Mark xiv. 42; John xiv. 31), *Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also*. That is to say, He summons those whom He had previously called to follow Him, now to leave their homes and accompany Him on His evangelistic tour. It would certainly seem as if our Lord saw that His celebrity as a healer was in danger of interfering with His work as a preacher. If He had returned, He would have been thronged, as He had been the evening before, by crowds of people curious to see some exhibition of miraculous power, or hoping to receive some miraculous benefit for themselves or their families, and He preferred to go to preach to minds less pre-occupied.

The last clause of our Lord's answer, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον, might be understood in a different sense from that given them by St Luke in his version, ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστράλην. We might connect the ἐξῆλθον of Mark i. 35 with the ἐξῆλθον of verse 38, and might understand our Lord as telling Simon and Andrew that it was with the view of preaching elsewhere that He had left their house in the morning. But since St Luke regards the verse as addressed to the crowds, it can have no other than its higher meaning.

MARK i. 39.

Καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

LUKE iv. 44.

Καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

The preposition εἰς, common to the two Evangelists, is evidence that St Luke has been using this verse of Mark as well as the rest of the section. St Mark's

ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς is a natural form of expression, St Luke's ἦν . . . εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς is not, and is hardly to be accounted for except on the supposition that St Luke has copied St Mark's preposition.

But it is a more important difference that whereas St Mark indicates the synagogues of *Galilee*, St Luke, according to the manuscripts which in other cases we have most reason to regard as having preserved for us the original text, says, the synagogues of *Judæa*. Now as to St Mark's reading there is no discordance of testimony, and the mention of Galilee here hangs together with St Mark's whole narrative.

However important to the natives of Palestine might be the distinction between two provinces of that country, the world outside did not care much for it, and *Judæa* was an appellation that might be applied to the whole land. Note for example St John's use of the phrase οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, in some cases where the story chiefly concerns inhabitants of Galilee. St Luke appears to use the word *Judæa* in this wide sense (Luke i. 5 and vii. 17), and in Luke xxiii. 5, Acts x. 37, he seems to speak of Galilee as part of *Judæa*. This is one of the cases in which my first disinclination to accept the reading of B has been removed by subsequent consideration, so that I am the less surprised at Hort's adoption of these readings in all cases.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

PRELIMINARY

The next story told by St Mark is that of the healing of the leper who said *If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean*; and in this order St Luke keeps St Mark company, except that he has placed his account of the calling of Peter (which St Mark relates before the incidents in the synagogue of Capernaum) before the story of the leper.

It is otherwise with St Matthew. To the end of his fourth chapter he has been in close contact with Mark; but then he breaks off, to report the discourse which we know as the Sermon on the Mount, which occupies his fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters. In the eighth chapter he comes again into contact with Mark, by relating this story of a leper, which, however, he distinctly places as chronologically following the Sermon on the Mount. Now this discourse may be regarded as one of the sections which ought to be regarded as having Q for its authority, being found both in Matthew and in Luke, but not in Mark. It is true that the discourse in Luke differs in many respects from that in Matthew—on these differences we shall comment presently—but still they have so many points in common, that it seems to me that we are bound to believe that the common authority used by St Matthew and St Luke contained at this point the report of a discourse of our Lord beginning with Beatitudes, and ending, as both do, with the parable of the man who built his house on the sand.

I feel then that if we are to deal with this discourse

of our Lord, it is this place, which was that assigned it by St Matthew, in which we ought to consider it.

MATT. v. 1, 2.

Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος* καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσήλθαν [αὐτῷ] οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων

LUKE vi. 20a.

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν

The accounts that St Matthew and St Luke severally give of the occasion when the discourse which they report was spoken, though diverse, are not incapable of being referred to the same occasion. According to St Matthew, our Lord was so pressed by the crowds that thronged Him that He retired with His disciples up the mountain, and there assuming the ordinary attitude of a preacher, sat down and delivered a discourse *to His disciples*. St Luke connects the discourse which he records with the separation of the twelve Apostles. This too, as St Mark records, took place on a mountain to which our Lord called up those whom He selected. Then, according to Luke vi. 17, He descended, not as the A. V. has it, to a *plain*, but to a *level place*, where not only were His disciples, but also a great multitude, who came to hear Him and to be healed of their diseases. That may easily be identified with the crowd of which St Matthew speaks.

St Matthew does not assert that none of the crowd joined the disciples in following our Lord to His retirement; neither does St Luke assert, though he may convey the idea, that the audience addressed by our Lord was a mixed multitude of strangers and disciples; but St Luke gives us to understand that it was the disciples who were specially addressed, for he begins his narrative, *He lifted up his eyes on his disciples and said*. Thus far, therefore, there is no proof that the two Evangelists employed different sources. It is only when we examine into details that we find such variations as to suggest that St Matthew and St Luke either derived their reports from different authorities, or else

that they are not treating of the same discourse. They differ from each other alternately by excess and by defect. It will be easier to come to a decision when we have made a detailed comparison of the reports of the two Evangelists.

However, before entering into this comparison, let me mention some considerations which would lead us to expect less closeness to its original in a report of our Lord's sayings than in a narrative of His actions.

Now it is not improper to remark that every ancient biographer or historian was allowed very great latitude in his report of the speeches which he put into the mouths of his characters. How could it be otherwise, when it is not imagined that the historian made use of stenographic reports taken at the time? The biographer was regarded as having satisfied all the claims of veracity if he gave the substance of what was said, though in words of his own. And soon it came to be regarded as needless to seek for evidence as to what was actually said; and the historian was felt to have done enough if the speeches with which he ornamented his compositions were suited to the character and circumstances of those into whose mouths they were put; and the writing of imaginary speeches for historical characters became a favourite rhetorical exercise.

In the case of our Lord's sayings, His biographers were under no temptation to invent fictitious speeches. His striking and pointed sayings lived in the memory of all who had heard them. The earliest accounts we have of the proceedings of the Christian Sunday meetings give an important place to the recital of the evangelic history of our Lord's actions. But besides, we are told that it was the customary duty of the president to deliver a hortatory address. And we cannot doubt that if he had been one who had heard our Lord, he would be sure to enforce his exhortations by quoting sayings of his Master. Thus, in addition to the traditions which were preserved of words spoken

by our Lord on particular occasions, there would also be in circulation a number of sayings ascribed to Him on good authority, but not in connexion with any account of the circumstances under which the words were spoken. Thus a biographer of our Lord who desired to give a specimen of His discourses would have ample materials at his disposal. Nor could he be regarded as unfaithful, though he collected into the form of a single discourse words uttered, it may be, on different occasions. In fact, we shall presently find that several of the sayings which, in St Matthew's Gospel, are given as part of the discourse now under consideration, are scattered through St Luke's, as parts of our Lord's conversation on different occasions.

I now go through St Matthew's report of the Sermon on the Mount, taking into connexion with it the parallels in other Gospels.

SECTION I.—THE BEATITUDES

MATT. v. 3-12.

LUKE vi. 20b-26.

This section of Matthew is fairly represented in Luke, but with such differences of details as to suggest that if the two mean to report the same discourse they got their information from different sources. On a general comparison it is seen at once that the Beatitudes in Matthew are much more expanded than in St Luke's version. In fact, to the eight Beatitudes of Matthew there answer but four in Luke; on the other hand, there are four Woes in Luke to which there is nothing corresponding in Matthew. But St Luke's version is confirmed by St James, in whose Epistle there are several traces of acquaintance with the Sermon on the Mount. It is impossible, for example, to read James v. 12 without feeling assured whence the Apostle drew the precept *Swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay.* There are several other verses which similarly

strike us as echoes of our Lord's Gospel teaching. It may be that the writer of the Epistle was a hearer of the Saviour's discourse, and in that case he is an independent witness; but if he shows acquaintance with either Gospel, it is rather of St Luke's than of St Matthew's that we are made to think. The beginning of chapter v. reminds us much of those Woes in the Gospel; and the verse James iv. 9, which speaks of the turning of laughter into mourning, reminds us of Luke vi. 25, which has no parallel in Matthew, *Woe unto you, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep.*

But far the most important difference that is found on the comparison of St Matthew's version with St Luke's is—what we should have scarcely expected—the more spiritual aspect of that which we should have supposed to be the Jewish version. St Matthew begins, *Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* St Luke has not the words *in spirit*, and has merely *Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.* It is no doubt true that riches bring temptations from which the poor man is exempt, and that thus the latter condition may rightly be described as the more blessed; yet this verse, taken in connexion with the others to be presently mentioned, has the aspect of teaching the doctrine that the mere fact of poverty or other suffering in this life entitles him who is under this disadvantage to compensations in the next; so that he who is now less prosperous may expect to be there more highly favoured. This is also the impression conveyed by the address to the rich man (Luke xvi. 25), *Remember that thou in thy lifetime receivest thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things: but now here he is comforted, and thou art in anguish.* We have, in the same connexion, to consider the first of the Woes in Luke vi. 24: *Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation;* but it is fair to take such a verse in connexion with St Luke's

own commentary (xii. 21): *So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God*, which clearly condemns, not the possession, but the abuse of riches.

There is a similar difference between Matthew and Luke as to the second Beatitude, recorded by the latter in the form *Blessed are ye that hunger now*. St Matthew has it *Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness*.

In the remaining Beatitudes the resemblance between the two Evangelists is more striking than their differences. I do not think that the differences which have been pointed out are easily reconciled on the supposition that either Evangelist had been using the work of the other. They seem to me rather to indicate that this discourse had reached the two Evangelists through different channels, which I ascribe to a difference, earlier than any written record, in the manner in which this discourse was recited in the public reading of different churches. The question, however, then arises, Which of the two reports is more likely to have been the original form in which the discourse was first delivered? or at least that in which it was first reported, say, in such a document as Q? I do not doubt that St Matthew has preserved for us the true interpretation of our Lord's words; and this is the interpretation which has been always given them in the Christian Church, and which has the more claim on our acceptance, as having been embodied in a document of such early date as St Matthew's Gospel, and, I doubt not, in Church teaching before that document was put into writing. The question, however, we have here to consider is, not the meaning of the words, but the form in which they were first delivered.

One solution that has been proposed is that the original form was that reported by St Matthew, but that St Luke modified it on account of his "Ebionite tendencies." Without, however, discussing the question whether the so-called Ebionite tendencies of

St Luke have not been much exaggerated, I must say that all my study of St Luke's writings inclines me to believe that, while he would have had no scruple in altering the wording of his original for the sake of literary improvement, he was quite incapable of making a substantial change in a discourse of his Master's, in order to bring its doctrine into greater conformity with his own, and therefore that such a variation as *πτωχοί*, instead of *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*, has its origin, not in an emendation by St Luke himself, but in the faithful transmission by that Evangelist of the form of the tradition which had reached him. I feel the same difficulty in believing that if the original form had been *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*, it could have been wilfully corrupted into *πτωχοί* by any Christian copyist or editor. But I do not feel the same difficulty in supposing that the opposite change might have taken place. Our Lord was in the habit of arresting the attention of His hearers by striking sayings, leaving it to His disciples, when they had caught the spirit of His precepts, to consider later with what limitations they were to be applied. There are other precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, which at the present day few of His disciples observe literally, the majority not believing that the Quaker doctrine of non-resistance expresses their true meaning.¹ In one case a difference of reading has arisen from the feeling that a command required some limitation in practice; and, to the condemnation of anger against a brother was added, in public teaching, the modification *without cause*, *εἰκῇ*. Yet critical editors pronounce that this addition does not belong to the original text. It would not be wonderful then, if, in the course of Christian instruction, words were added

¹ Note that those who now put the most literal interpretation on our Lord's precept of non-resistance are of all others those who are least disposed to understand literally the benediction, *Blessed are ye poor*; and we can easily believe that there was the same reluctance among the first hearers of the Gospel.

to prevent the disciples from putting a false construction on the Saviour's words, and if it was with such an addition that the words reached St Matthew.

It seems to me that the teaching which seemed to inculcate poverty was less likely to be misunderstood when our Lord uttered it than a few years afterwards. The Epistle of James, to which I have already referred, exhibits the class jealousies between rich and poor which then distracted the Jewish nation; and the sympathy of the Christian community was naturally with the class to which most of them belonged. But the disciples whom our Lord first enlisted could certainly not be described as *πτωχοί*. The Apostles were not chosen from the very poor, but belonged to at least the lower middle class: a publican was not likely to be a pauper; Peter and the father of James and John owned ships, and the latter had hired servants. A man was not called *πλούσιος* unless he had large landed possessions, but the word was used in a metaphorical sense (1 Cor. iv. 8; Rev. iii. 17). The only disciples who could in any sense be called *πτωχοί* were those who had given up all to follow our Lord, yet even these were not expected to remain permanently in this state of poverty; for their Master promised them, not merely eternal life, but that now in this time they should receive back houses and lands a hundredfold (Mark x. 30). On the whole, though as a general rule, when the question relates to any thing contained in Q, I regard St Matthew as likely to be closer to his original than St Luke, in the present case I am disposed to accept St Luke's shorter version of the first Beatitude as its original form, chiefly on the ground that it is easier to believe this to have been altered by addition than that a change should have been made on the opposite hypothesis.

SECTION II.—THE INFLUENCE OF THE CITIZENS
OF THE KINGDOM. Matt. v. 13-16

MARK ix. 50.

Καλὸν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ
τὸ ἅλας ἀναλον γένηται, ἐν
τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε; ἔχετε
ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα, καὶ εἰρη-
νεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

MATT. v. 13.

Ῥμεῖς ἐστέ τὸ ἅλας τῆς
γῆς· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μωρ-
ανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀλισθήσεται;
εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι εἰ μὴ
βληθὲν ἔξω καταπατεῖσθαι
ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

LUKE xiv. 34, 35.

Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν
δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ,
ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται; οὔτε
εἰς γῆν οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν
εὐθετόν ἐστιν· ἔξω βάλ-
λουσιν αὐτό.

This passage has parallels both in Mark and Luke ; but in neither of these Gospels is it found in the same connexion as here. In St Matthew's Gospel the connexion is clear enough. Our Lord's discourse was addressed, not to the mixed multitude, but to the disciples who had obeyed His call to follow Him. He had begun by proclaiming the blessedness of the life to which He had called them, and now He warns them of the responsibility that attended their high position. They were to be the salt of the earth, whose function would be to flavour the whole mass ; but what if they themselves were flavourless? It is the same lesson which He presently teaches by a different illustration (see Matt. vi. 23). They were also to be the light of the world ; but what if that which was to enlighten the whole were itself darkness?

St Luke has the saying, but not as part of the discourse which he records in his sixth chapter. It is found in his fourteenth chapter, and as part of a discourse delivered to a different audience ; that is to say, not to the disciples only, but to the crowds who thronged Jesus, and who showed a desire to become His disciples. These He warned to count well the cost before they committed themselves to such a step. We shall afterwards have good reasons for believing that St Luke was acquainted with St Mark's Gospel ; and though I believe that he is using a different authority here, yet the beginning, *καλὸν τὸ ἅλας*, leads me to think that St Luke's version has been here modified by St Mark's.

Matt. v. 14-16. These verses have their appropriate place here as continuing the exhortation to the disciples to fulfil the purpose they have been chosen to serve. They were to be lights to the world, illuminating it by their teaching and their example, therefore they must exercise and display the gift entrusted to them.

There is only one verse of these three that is represented in the other Gospels.

MARK iv. 21, 22.

Μήτι ἐρχεται ὁ λύχνος
ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ
ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, οὐχ ἵνα
ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ; οὐ
γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτὸν ἕαν
μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ, οὐδὲ
ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ'
ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν.

MATT. v. 15.

Οὐδὲ καλοῦσιν λύχ-
νον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν
ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ'
ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ
λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν
τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

LUKE viii. 16, 17.

Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας
καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ
ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθῃσιν,
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθῃσιν,
ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέ-
πωσιν τὸ φῶς. οὐ γὰρ
ἔστιν κρυπτὸν δ' οὐ φανε-
ρὸν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπό-
κρυφον δ' οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ
καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ.

LUKE xi. 33.

Οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς
κρύπτῃν τίθῃσιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ
τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν
λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευό-
μενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν.

It will be seen that this verse of St Matthew's Sermon on the Mount has its counterpart in one verse of Mark, and in two distinct passages of Luke. In neither Gospel has it a place corresponding to that given it by St Matthew; whence I conclude that this whole section had no place in the account of the present discourse given in the source used by St Luke. St Luke's double record of this saying points to his use of two sources, and in the first of these two citations the source was certainly Mark. This cannot be doubted by any one who compares the context in the two Gospels. These verses (Mark iv. 21, 22; Luke viii. 16, 17) will come again under consideration in their proper place. For the present it is enough to remark that we have here in Luke a combination of verses found together in Mark, but not naturally clinging together; whence I find the conclusion confirmed which I have already adopted,

that St Luke made use of St Mark's Gospel. The second passage which I have quoted from Luke (xi. 33) comes in continuation of another discourse also reported by St Matthew, viz., that concerning the sign of Jonah the prophet. It comes also in company with other verses (Luke xi. 34-36) reported by St Matthew as part of the present discourse (Matt. vi. 22, 23). The conclusion then to which we are led is that St Luke, in addition to using St Mark's Gospel, employed also a source used by St Matthew. When they differ in their arrangement of this common matter we are bound to be cautious before we pretend to decide what was the order of the original.

SECTION III.—THE AUTHORITY OF THE MOSAIC LAW.

Matt. v. 17-20

This section and that which immediately follows are scarcely at all represented in the discourse recorded by St Luke in chap. vi. The next section (vv. 21-48) beginning with *Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time*, contains a number of sharp authoritative criticisms on the doctrine taught by the recognised teachers of the day, which claimed to be embodied in the ordinances of Moses himself. But before entering on these criticisms, our Lord prefaced them by the most ample acknowledgment of His sense of the value and authority of the Mosaic Law. And certainly the replacement of Mosaism by Christianity affords an almost unique example in the world's history of putting a new cloth on an old garment, without making the least rent from the old. If our Lord had come as the preacher of an entirely new religion, it might easily have been recognised as a better one than the Law of Moses expounded by the Scribes and Pharisees. A righteousness far higher than theirs was inculcated by One who, laying less stress than they on the external fulfilment of precepts, insisted on their being fully carried out in their spirit, and who withdrew exceptions and limitations

that had been tolerated for a time. But what our Lord taught was, not a new religion, but the old one better understood ; and never did the authority of the old legislator stand higher than it has done among the disciples of the new Teacher. The testimony of the opponents of Christianity strikingly exhibits the twofold character of our Lord's teaching, which combined the fullest acknowledgment of the divine mission of Moses, with a fearless assertion of an independent right to examine into, and either confirm or annul his ordinances. The contemporary opponents of our Lord were most struck with His opposition to Moses, and their constant charge against Jesus and His followers was that they spoke blasphemous words against Moses and against the Law. But in later times the frequent attempts that have been made (to use Paley's language¹) to *attack Christianity through the sides of Judaism* show that all modern unbelievers readily allow that *the divine legation of Moses* is attested by the full weight of our Lord's authority.

There are none of our Lord's sayings which bear a stronger mark of genuineness than those in which He criticises and enlarges the Mosaic precepts ; and therefore the only question that needs here to be discussed is the chronological place in His history of this part of His instructions. Now though this section occurs in the earliest discourse which St Matthew has preserved, it evidently could not have formed part of the earliest of all our Lord's discourses. He would say *Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets*, except to people to whom He had already, by previous language, given reason to suspect Him of rebellion against their authority. And therefore we cannot altogether refuse to entertain the idea that St Matthew may have amalgamated some portions of a later discourse of our Lord with a report of this early discourse not longer than that which St Luke has preserved.

¹ *Evidences*, iii. 3.

Verse 18 is the only one of the four verses of this section which has a counterpart in Luke, and that not in a parallel place.

MATT. v. 18.

Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κερέα οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἕως [ἂν] πάντα γένηται.

LUKE xvi. 17.

Εὐκοπώτερον δὲ ἐστὶν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κερέα πεσεῖν.

It does not seem to me likely that if St Luke was acquainted with the whole section as it appears in Matthew, he would have omitted three of the verses, and placed the fourth in a different context, where the ingenuity of commentators has been taxed to make out that it has any connexion with either what precedes or what follows. This one verse is a striking one, which might easily have been preserved independently of its original context; and having become known to St Luke through its citation in the Apostolic teaching was one which he did not choose to omit from incorporation in his Gospel, even though he was without guidance as to the place to which it properly belonged.

Matt. v. 20. This verse leads up to the next section, which goes on to show how much higher was the standard of righteousness inculcated by our Lord than that enjoined by the Scribes and Pharisees, notwithstanding that He treated as unimportant some precepts which they insisted on as essential.

SECTION IV.—THE EXTENSION OF THE MOSAIC LAW.

Matt. v. 21-48

(a) *The Law of Murder.* Matt. v. 21-26

In verse 22 I omit the word εἰκῇ after ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, both because it is not found in the oldest authorities for the text, and also because it is much easier to account for its insertion if it had not originally formed part of the text than for its omission if it had.

We need not appeal to other passages of Scripture to prove that there are occasions when the sentiment of anger may lawfully be entertained; and it would appear to have been at a tolerably early period that, in public reading, a modification was made to mitigate the extreme severity of the saying if expressed without any qualification.¹

This section is one of several, of which, as a series, there is no trace in Luke, viz., a series beginning with the formula *ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις*. The precepts *Thou shalt do no murder*; *Thou shalt not commit adultery*; *An eye for an eye*, etc., were not commands of anonymous ancients, but a portion of the Mosaic Law ordained by God Himself. But the rendering *to them of old time* brings out the principle which is expressly laid down (Matt. xix. 8), that the character of precepts must vary with the character of those to whom they are addressed. It is there stated that Moses, on account of the hardness of the people's hearts, permitted a laxity which was not to be continued under the New Dispensation; consequently in the phrase *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν* the emphasis is as much on the *ὑμῖν* as on the *ἐγώ*.

I cannot but be struck by the systematic character of the Sermon on the Mount as reported by St Matthew. I have already remarked with reference to the history of our Lord's actions, that often where St Matthew's report would seem to be a collection of unconnected anecdotes, St Mark's places them in a historical connexion. It is just the reverse with respect to our Lord's sayings: While St Luke's report might seem to be a casual collection of our Lord's utterances on different occasions, independently remembered, St Matthew's gives them a connected and systematic form. This has been ascribed by some to the more ingenious workmanship of this Evangelist; but I rather believe it to be due to his being able to give, whether from his own recollection or from the report of others, a more

¹ (See p. 115.)

accurate representation of the form in which the discourse was first delivered. We have to ask ourselves, how is it that St Luke could have missed this systematic treatment if he had found it in the authority which he followed. We have seen in the case of the last two sections, that St Luke shows acquaintance with a single verse of each, but no acquaintance with the connexion of this verse with the rest. Of the six verses in the section now under consideration only the last two are recognised by Luke, and are by him (in chap. xii. 58, 59), appended to quite a different discourse, which corresponds to one at the beginning of Matt. xvi. ; but even with that these two verses have no obvious connexion.

Then the question arises, May not St Luke's report have been written down from memory? Not the memory of having himself heard our Lord deliver it; for St Luke in his preface makes no pretension to having been one of our Lord's original disciples; but the memory of having heard the speech recited by one of the first witnesses.

The idea that we have in Luke a report from memory of part of the discourse recorded in St Matthew's Gospel is strongly confirmed, when we find close agreement, with great variety of expression. I take as an example a clause of the section we are now dealing with. Suppose that any one desired to repeat the following which he had heard some time before:—

MATT. v. 25, 26.

*Ἰσθὶ εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ ἕως ὅτου εἴ μετ' αὐτοῦ
ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, μὴ ποτέ σε παραδῷ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷ κριτῇ, καὶ ὁ
κριτὴς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ· ἀμὴν λέγω
σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως ἂν ἀποδῷς τὸν ἔσχατον
κοδράντην.*

should we regard the memory very unfaithful of the man who should reproduce it in the form:—

LUKE xii. 58, 59.

*ὥς γὰρ ὑπάγεις μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου σου ἐπ' ἄρχοντα,
ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἔργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι [ἀπ'] αὐτοῦ, μὴ ποτε
κατασύρῃ σε πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς σε παραδώσει*

τῷ πράκτορι, καὶ ὁ πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς φυλακὴν. λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτὸν ἀποδῶς.

The two versions convey the same ideas, though in different language, and there does not seem adequate reason for designed variation in the wording. I frankly own that if all the cases we have to account for resembled this example, I should not require any other explanation than that we have here two independent translations from the same Aramaic original; and I may add that in *memoriter* citation, while we should expect much of the wording of the original to be altered, we should also expect many phrases to be retained, and that there could not be such a complete change as in the present example. But it seems to me that the omission of whole sections could not occur to one who was using a document, even for the purpose of translation, and therefore that we cannot dispense with the explanation of failure of memory. Any one who attempts to address an audience without the help of notes will find that, while on particular topics he has fairly said what he had intended to say, he has omitted several subjects of which he had meant to speak.

If the Sermon on the Mount must always hold a leading place in the history of the development of ethical teaching, it is because of its insistence on the doctrine that sin consists not so much in the outward act as in the state of mind that prompted the act. The teaching of the section now under consideration is briefly expressed in St John's Epistle (1 St John iii. 15) in the formula *Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer*, and every one can understand that the murder has its source in the previous hatred. I do not suppose that verse 22 would have seemed to need any mitigation, if instead of *Everyone who is angry with his brother*, it had run *Everyone who hateth his brother*. I shall not enquire whether the Aramaic word used by our Lord might not have been one which would not have been employed to denote a feeling so transient as anger

often is; for, in any case, it must be acknowledged that if hatred can be described as undeveloped murder, so anger may be described as undeveloped hatred. This verse 22 by no means describes all the offences which it classes under the head of murder as deserving to be visited with equal punishment; for it plainly acknowledges that in proportion to the violence with which the feeling finds expression, so does it come under the cognizance of a tribunal to inflict more severe punishment. But certainly anger if indulged tends to grow into hatred; so that it is intelligible that our Lord should add to the precept *Thou shalt not hate thy brother* the practical advice: If you have in your heart any such feeling against him, it must be dismissed at once. There must be no delay; even if you are on the way to make an offering in the temple, the duty of dismissing hatred must first be attended to. Delays are dangerous. Your adversary has a charge against you, and you must reconcile yourself to him, without giving him time to bring it before the judge.

(b) *The Law of Adultery.* Matt. v. 27-30.

In this section the same extension is given to the command, *Thou shalt not commit adultery* as in the last section was given to the command, *Thou shalt do no murder*. The first two of these verses have no parallel in the other Gospels, but those which follow occur also in Mark ix. 43-47, though with some variation of language, and in a different connexion. And the curious point, as exhibiting the use of two sources by St Matthew, is that in addition to the version given here, which probably comes ultimately from an Aramaic source, he gives in a later chapter (xviii. 8, 9) the same instruction about parting with the eye or the hand, with Mark's peculiarities of diction and in Mark's connexion. Thus instead of the *συμφέρει* of Matt. v. we have Mark's *καλὸν ἐστίν*. In Matt v., of the members to be parted with, two are mentioned;

first, the right eye, then, the right hand ; but Matt. xviii. agrees with Mark in mentioning three members : a hand, a foot, and an eye, the eye being mentioned last, and there being no mention of a *right* hand or a *right* eye. Again, the conclusion in Matt. v. is that it is better that one member should be lost than that the whole body should be cast into hell ; in Mark and in Matt. xviii., the alternative is between entering into life halt, or maimed, or one-eyed, rather than, having two hands or feet or eyes, to be cast into hell. St Matthew even preserves Mark's word *μονόφθαλμον*. This evidence seemed to me to prove that, while it must be acknowledged that Matt. v. is derived from an independent source, probably Q, Matt. xviii. is but a transcript of Mark ; and this suggested a theory as to the composition of St Matthew's Gospel, viz., that the Evangelist began by using Q as his authority, but that, on revising his work, he added some touches derived from Mark ; and besides, at the end, some whole sections derived from Mark which had not been represented in Q.

In any case it is plain that St Matthew, besides using Q, used also another source, which it is natural to think might be a Petrine tradition, to which I have proposed to give the name of P. But a lecture which I heard from Dr Armitage Robinson brought me to think that when St Matthew and St Luke seem to be using P it is really Mark they are using, and that it is to his Gospel exclusively that we owe the preservation of that tradition. But the present example convinces me that it was prudent to abstain from using a notation which would commit me to the adoption of Dr Robinson's doctrine. Yet I am much impressed by what has already been pointed out, as to the Marcan character of the language of Matt. xviii. ; and it may be that what St Matthew reports was the form in which St Mark had been in the habit of enunciating the teaching of St Peter, although not that which he incorporated in his own Gospel.

It will to readers of the present day seem superfluous that I should discuss whether Origen was right in his literal interpretation of the kindred verse Matt. xix. 12. But it is only candid to state what might be urged in favour of that interpretation. It is obvious that when a man striving after holiness finds that his bodily frame puts a stumbling block in the way of his endeavours, it is commonly not his hand, or his foot, or his eye that is the offending member; and the direction to cut it off, in the Sermon on the Mount, immediately follows the charge against looking on a woman to lust after her. Thus we should be disposed to understand in the literal sense Matt. xix. 12. But St Mark omits this verse, and he puts in a different connexion (ix. 43), the verse about casting away the offending member, this verse being apparently suggested to St Mark by the use of the word *σκανδαλίση* in the verse immediately preceding, *Whosoever shall put a stumbling block in the way of one of these little ones*; and similarly, I have not been able to trace more than a verbal suggestion to account for the way in which St Mark brings in the saying, *καλὸν τὸ ἀλας* at the end of the same discourse.

Certainly our best guide to the true interpretation of sayings of our Lord is the manner in which they were understood by the disciples who heard them, and by the Church which He founded; and this is our best safeguard against the numerous heresies which have had their origin in the private interpretation of isolated texts. I find no evidence that self-mutilation was ever practised, or even permitted, among the Jews. St Mark, as I have said, gives no countenance to the literal interpretation of our Lord's words. There is no sign of teaching with this tendency in any remains of what purported to be Hebrew Gospels; and before the notable case at Alexandria the idea of self-mutilation seems never to have been entertained in the Christian Church, not even in Phrygia where fanaticism ran wild. Regarding then a literal interpretation of our

Lord's words to be untenable, I cannot explain them better than Bishop Gore has done in his *Exposition of The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 66-68: "A safe life is better than a complete life. . . . Whatever exposes us to temptation that is too strong for us must at all costs be abandoned. . . . Better to live a maimed life than with all our faculties about us to be destined to moral death. . . . Any sacrifice is worth making sooner than that the lower part of our nature should lord it over the higher."

(c) *The Law of Divorce.* Matt v. 31-32.

Here again we have a duplicate in Matthew; for this disallowance of divorce is repeated in xix. 9, but St Matthew's account is that the words were spoken on different occasions: once in the spontaneous teaching of our Lord, and a second time in answer to a question by the Scribes and Pharisees. If we have been right in concluding that in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew there is an echo of the end of the ninth chapter of Mark, we can hardly avoid conceding that there is a like relation between the sections which follow in both Gospels; Mark x. 2-12 clearly corresponding to Matt. xix. 3-12. When we come to that chapter in Mark it will be time enough to make a minute comparison of the two accounts, and we may then discuss which of the two may be regarded as the primary authority. But Matt. v. seems plainly to come from a source independent of Mark, and the two may be compared with each other as equally entitled to rank as primary authorities. The most important result of the comparison is that the precept which in Mark is stated without limitation is in Matthew modified by the addition *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*; and when St Matthew repeats the precept in chapter xix., he makes a like addition, *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*.

This difference has given rise to a difference of practice in the Church, the Roman Church forbidding

remarriage, even to the innocent husband of a wife who has committed adultery, a strictness which does not prevail in either the Eastern or the Anglican Church.

I must reject, as an unsuccessful piece of special pleading, Döllinger's attempt to reconcile the Roman prohibition with Matthew, on the plea that *πορνεία* is not *μοιχεία*, and therefore can only refer to defilement contracted before marriage. Besides that this interpretation is hopelessly modern, it is unreasonable to hold that a husband is not at liberty to divorce a wife who has been unfaithful to her marriage vow, but that he may send her away on account of a fault committed before she had made any vow of faithfulness to him, or contracted any obligation towards him. But the fatal weakness of the theory is in its assumption that *πορνεία* does not include *μοιχεία*, while 1 Cor. v. 1, where it is applied to adultery and incest, would alone suffice to prove the contrary; and other proofs can be given that *πορνεία* was a general word, including all forms of unchastity, of which *μοιχεία* is one.

Again, it is contended that in this case a man may put away his wife, that is to say, may separate her from bed and board, but still consider her so much his wife as to be incapable of marriage with another. But I do not know of any evidence that in our Lord's time there had been invented this method of acknowledging a woman to be a wife, but treating her as if she were not. If divorce to this extent is permissible, and if we are not to interpret the limitation in Matthew as putting a distinction between adultery and other causes for separation, the law of Deuteronomy practically remains in force. A man in whose eyes his wife, for any cause, does not find favour, may deal with her as the husband of an adulterous wife is permitted to do; and, provided he does not marry again, need not regard his vow to love his wife, comfort her, honour and keep her.

If notice be taken of another variation between St

Matthew's version (in chapter xix.) and St Mark's, no fair-minded critic can doubt that the limitations in Matthew were made with the express purpose of removing any prohibition against divorcing an adulterous wife. The question with which the Pharisees tempted our Lord is, according to St Mark's version, *Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?* but according to St Matthew, *Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?* In fact, the question touches on a dispute which then went on between rival schools of expounders of the Law. Moses had said (Deut. xxiv. 1) that a man might lawfully put away his wife *if she found no favour in his eyes, because he had found some unseemly thing in her*; and that on his then giving her a bill of divorcement, she might be another man's wife. The laxer school of rabbis gave the husband unlimited power of divorce, if for any cause his wife found no favour in his eyes; the stricter gave him the power only if he had found *some unseemly thing* in her. But it was agreed on both sides that the wife's adultery would be a sufficient cause for divorce. If, therefore, St Matthew has correctly reported the question put to our Lord, as whether a man might put away his wife *for every cause*, the case of adultery was outside the question on which our Lord was asked to give a decision; and it needed no special formula of exclusion to make His answer not applicable to it. Thus it does not appear to me that St Matthew reports our Lord as having said anything to disallow the remarriage of an innocent divorced person.

The question then arises, If there be a discordance, which report are we to follow? Which is more likely to represent the record first made of our Lord's words? A question of criticism must be decided on critical grounds without regard to doctrinal consequences; and it seems to me that St Mark's version, which appears to disallow divorce without any exception, is more likely to represent the common source than St Matthew's, which excepts the case of the adulterous wife. For it

is much easier to account for St Matthew's insertion of the words than for St Mark's omission of them, if they had been in his original. The case is parallel to the various reading we have already discussed a few verses previously, where in our Lord's censure of him who is angry with his brother *without cause*, the last two words have not the support of the best authorities. And the example illustrates how little effect the decision of a critical question may often have on our interpretation; for no one who refuses to give $\epsilon\iota\kappa\eta$ a place in his text of Matt. v. 22, feels himself bound to deny that cases may arise when a man may, without sin, be angry with his brother.

It is quite conceivable that our Lord may have issued His prohibition of divorce, without making any exceptions, and yet that the Evangelist, in reporting the saying, might, in order to prevent misunderstanding, have thought it necessary to express the limitation without which the precept would have been rejected as absurd. Who would think it his duty to go on living with a wife who was unfaithful to him? and in those days there does not seem to have been devised any middle course between living with a wife and parting from her. We are not so much concerned with the words of our Lord, as with the meaning which He desired to convey. And to that meaning we could not have a better guide than the earliest commentator, St Matthew, who has sufficiently indicated how he understood it, and who has been recognised by the Church for centuries as an authorised interpreter of our Lord's meaning.

A few words must be said as to the only parallel to this section to be found in Luke. It consists of but a single verse (xvi. 18), which is substantially the same as the last verse of the section in Mark which we are discussing, and which asserts that it is adultery either to put away one's wife and marry another, or to marry one whom another has put away. This verse in Luke comes immediately after the saying that *it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fail,*

and immediately before the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. I cannot say that I am satisfied with any of the reasons that have been given why it should be so placed; but as Luke is not a primary authority for it, we need not be much concerned if we can give no better reason for the place it occupies, than that it was a saying of our Lord which the Evangelist desired to include in his Gospel, and for which he could find no other more convenient place.

(d) *The Law of Perjury.* Matt. v. 33-37.

There being no parallel to this section in the other Gospels, it hardly falls within the province of this work. I am inclined, however, to think that St Luke's silence arises from ignorance of this section in St Matthew's form.

(e) *The Law of Revenge.* Matt. v. 38-42.

At length we come again to a section of the Sermon on the Mount which has something corresponding in the parallel discourse in Luke vi., the latter in this case having very much the appearance of a *memoriter* report of the former. I can well believe that St Luke faithfully reports the form in which the substance of the discourse was reported in the Church teaching he had received; for this is one of the sections which begin *Ye have heard that it was said, . . . but I say unto you*, a formula which I have already said I do not think that St Luke would have suppressed if he had heard it or read it, though a trace remains of the ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν in Luke vi. 27, where he begins this series of precepts with Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, where the context does not suggest that he should begin with ἀλλά.

That which is criticised in this section, *An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth*, was not intended to regulate private retaliation, but was an ordinance of the Law, probably intended to mitigate the revenge which a

sense of injury prompts, and to take care that retaliation should not exceed the injury done, and that an injured man should be so sure of getting reasonable redress by due course of law, that he should have no temptation to take the law into his own hands. It would seem that our Lord taught His disciples not to invoke the aid of the law, nor even take all that human tribunals might declare to be their right. This appears from the curious difference between the versions of one of these commands in Matthew and in Luke: Matt. v. 40, *τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον*. St Luke, vi. 29, transposes the cloak and the coat, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄιροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς*. A hasty reader would be tempted to say that St Luke's version must be the right one; for the *ἱμάτιον* was the outer garment; the *χιτῶν*, the inner; and clearly any one who violently despoiled you of your garments must begin with the outer one. But St Matthew's *τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι* show that what is contemplated is not a case of forcible seizure, but of a suit at law, in which the less valuable article, the *χιτῶν*, was claimed; and it is recommended that so far from resisting, even the more costly garment should be resigned. It may be doubted whether our Lord's prohibition against being a defendant in a lawsuit was intended to apply when the offender was an outsider, and it may have been in order to make the precept agree with what immediately became the practical interpretation given it by the Church that St Matthew's form came to be altered to that reported by St Luke.

MATT. v. 39.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

LUKE vi. 29a.

Τῷ τύποντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

The difference here between St Matthew's version and St Luke's seems to be sufficiently accounted for by stylistic considerations. In this and the next section we have the ideas of Matthew expressed in St Luke's words.

MATT. v. 42.

Τὸ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα
ἀπὸ σοῦ δανίσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.

LUKE vi. 35a.

Πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν
καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδὲν
ἀπελπίζοντες.

Our Lord's disciples found it easier to bear the unlawful taking of their goods, because He taught them to cultivate the habit of spontaneous giving; and even if a gift were asked for under the name of a loan, not to refuse through fear of not obtaining repayment. In Luke there is a various reading *μηδένα* for *μηδέν*; but the latter is much the best attested; and it is so easy a transcriber's error to introduce the *α* which is the first letter of the following word, that I have no difficulty in adopting the reading *μηδέν*. But it is possible that the addition of *α* may be no transcriber's error; for the real difficulty is with the word *ἀπελπίζοντες* which is the opposite of *ἐλπίζω*, and means *to give up hope, to despair*. Consequently commentators who will not admit the possibility that the Evangelist could have written incorrect Greek insist on translating *despairing of nothing*, or *despairing of nobody*. If we are to understand the word as *despairing*, the latter certainly makes better sense, and this may account for the change of *μηδέν* into *μηδένα*. But this translation imparts a new idea, and I think Field was right in saying that "the context is here too strong for philological quibbles." It is not merely that we find the thoughts nearly the same in the discourses reported by St Matthew and by St Luke, however different the forms of expression sometimes are (and here we should be obliged to regard St Luke as introducing a thought to which there is nothing corresponding in Matthew), but St Luke's own context equally repels this interpretation. He had just quoted as a saying of our Lord's, *If ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye?* and surely we should expect the command which follows to run, *Then lend to them of whom you do not hope to receive*. And so this command is interpreted in the Vulgate, *nihil inde sperantes*, which is followed in the A. V. But the difficulty is how to find this sense in the words,

if we give to the word ἀπελπίξω its ordinary meaning. The interpretation we are asked to substitute is, No matter how poor the prospect of repayment may be, do not despair of it. Perhaps they will ultimately repay; if they do not, God will. The latter thought looks like one which might easily occur to St Luke, with whom it is found in a parallel passage, xiv. 12-14: *When thou makest a feast, bid the poor . . . they have not wherewith to recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just.* The same idea occurs in the Old Testament command (Deut. xv. 9, 10) about giving shortly before the year of release, when there was no promise of repayment: *Thine heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him: because that for this thing the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thy work.* Yet if this had been what was intended here, the thought would not have been so very obscurely expressed; and it does not harmonise with the present context. If you give money only because you have the prospect of being repaid, either by the borrowers themselves, or certainly by the Almighty, it might still be said, If ye give only in the hope of receiving back again, what thank have ye? I think it likely therefore that St Luke has but recorded our Lord's words as they had come to be translated in the Church reading of his time, in a rendering possibly due to men who had less knowledge of Greek than himself. The ἐλπίζω of verse 34 would naturally be balanced by ἀπελπίξω in verse 35; and no one would have felt any difficulty if the verse had run, *Lend, giving up hope of receiving anything back.* That instead of *anything* we have here μηδέν is an awkwardness of expression which perhaps is more felt by us than by men accustomed to the Greek double negative.

(f) *The Law of Enmity.* Matt. v. 43-48.

MATT. v. 44.

Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ
προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων
ὑμᾶς.

LUKE vi. 27, 28.

Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς
ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε
τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε
περὶ τῶν ἐπηραζόντων ὑμᾶς.

This section adheres very closely to the last. We have much of it in St Luke's version; but while there is identity as respects the thoughts, there is diversity as respects the language and arrangement.

In St Matthew's arrangement the present section is the concluding one of the series of precepts to each of which is prefixed ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, the saying here commented on being *Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy*, the latter part of which has scarcely Mosaic authority. But besides what is implied in the limitation to one's neighbour of the commandment of love, there may be quoted the direction in Deut. xxiii. 6 about the Moabites and Ammonites, *Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever*, a verse quoted by Ezra (ix. 12). In St Luke's report the commandment of love to enemies comes next after the prologue of Beatitudes and Woes, and begins the hortatory part of the discourse.

MATT. v. 45.

Ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροῦς καὶ ἀγαθοῦς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.

LUKE vi. 35b.

Καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς, καὶ ἔσσεσθε υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστὸς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀχαρίστοις καὶ πονηροῖς.

Here the thought is the same in both versions, but the expression of it much clearer in St Matthew's.

MATT. v. 46, 47.

Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.

LUKE vi. 32-34.

Καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν. καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιήτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν. καὶ ἐὰν δανίσγητε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις [ἐστίν]; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν τὰ ἴσα.

Here we have the same thoughts expressed equally intelligibly in both versions, and we need not discuss whether it is that St Matthew has abridged, or that St Luke has expanded. But we must notice how for

St Matthew's οἱ τελῶναι in verse 46 and οἱ ἔθνικοί in verse 47, St Luke has in both places substituted οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί. The word ἔθνικός in Jewish usage had such a flavour of contempt that St Luke, writing for Gentiles, might well avoid it. The opportunities of oppression possessed by the farmers of taxes made the name of *publican* odious in all countries; and so we find the association of the words *publicans and sinners* not only in Matt. ix. 10, xi. 19, and the parallel passages, but also in St Luke's Gentile Gospel (xv. 1; xix. 7). Yet we can understand why in a Gospel intended to be used outside Palestine it should be advisable in Luke vi. 32 to substitute the general word ἁμαρτωλοί for St Matthew's τελῶναι.

MATT. v. 48.

Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατήρ
ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν.

LUKE vi. 36.

Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς ὁ πατήρ
ὑμῶν οἰκτίρων ἐστίν.

This clause in Luke follows the exhortation to be *sons of the Most High* who is *kind toward the unthankful and the evil*. It is perhaps one of the traces of the use of the Sermon on the Mount in the Epistle of James that in the latter the adjective τέλειος occurs five times. See in particular James i. 4, 17; iii. 2.

SECTION V.—ACTS OF DEVOTION: ALMSGIVING,
PRAYER, FASTING.

MATT. vi. 1-18.

This whole chapter is absent from the parallel place of Luke, though about half of it is utilised in other parts of his Gospel. But he seems nowhere to make any use of the section ending verse 18, which forbids doing our good deeds in order to gain reputation among men, save that Luke's ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν (vi. 24) would lead us to think that he was not unacquainted with the thrice repeated ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν of Matt vi.

The treatment of this section is as systematic as that

of the section in chapter v., also omitted by St Luke, on the extension of the precepts of the Mosaic Law. It does not seem likely that these two great sections should be designedly omitted by St Luke, and therefore I am disposed to believe that these sections had been already omitted in the form of Evangelic teaching which he had heard.

The difficulty is increased when we come to the Lord's Prayer. It is no doubt conceivable that the tradition had come to St Luke that the prayer had been first taught by our Lord to His disciples, in answer to a request that He would teach them a form, as John had done; and that, intending to relate this at a later stage of his narrative, he therefore omitted the prayer from his report of our Lord's first sermon. But could he ever have read it as part of that discourse? In the first place, it is natural to think that if he had, he would have given to the request to be taught a prayer an earlier place in his narrative. And, moreover, if our Lord had taught the prayer in the form given by St Matthew, we should expect it to be preserved too faithfully to permit the loss of the clauses which St Luke has omitted. So we have to consider the possibility that the insertion of the prayer in the discourse was a later addition; and that the two forms of it which we have represent the uses of two different churches, both of which employed in their service substantially the same prayer, having for its basis the prayer which our Lord had taught. We can well accept this explanation with regard to the doxology, which the evidence does not allow us to regard as a genuine part of St Matthew's Gospel, but which undoubtedly represents very early liturgical usage.

The chief variations between St Matthew's version and St Luke's are that instead of *Our Father which art in heaven* we have simply *Father*; and that the clauses beginning *Thy will be done*, and *Deliver us from evil* are omitted. The comment in verses 14, 15, on the petition which pleads our willingness to forgive our brethren as a condition for our gaining God's forgiveness, appears

as an independent precept in Mark xi. 25; and it may be thought that such a precept would have been unnecessary if the disciples had been already taught to embody it in their prayers. But what I have already remarked about the systematic character of the two large sections omitted by St Luke raises the question whether these are not such as we might expect in a written composition rather than in an extemporary address. In the absence of stenographic reports, we should not expect ordinary memories to be able to retain with much accuracy a full report of so carefully planned a discourse. Yet I do not think that anything that can properly be called miraculous was needed to bring about the fulfilment of our Lord's promise that His Spirit would bring to the memories of His disciples what He had said to them. To recall His teaching would be one of the first efforts of His disciples after He had parted from them. For the accomplishment of such an object there could not be a more effectual means than mutual conference. What one had forgotten would be supplied by another, in whose mind even a report at first imperfect would revive recollections which would fill in details not adequately represented in the first instance. Thus the Gospel history, as delivered by an Apostle to the first disciples, would tend to grow in fulness and accuracy.

SECTION VI.—TRUST IN GOD.

MATT. vi. 19-34.

The sayings of our Lord contained in the latter half of St Matthew's sixth chapter, beginning with verse 19, seem to have been all known to St Luke, who places them, however, in different connexions. The large section beginning with verse 25, *Be not anxious for your life*, appears with comparatively little change in Luke xii. 22-31. At the end of this section (Luke xii. 33-34) St Luke shows his knowledge of the sayings which

St Matthew has placed at the beginning, *Lay not up for yourselves treasures, etc.* (vv. 19-21) in which our Lord contrasts the uncertainty of earthly riches with the permanence of treasure in heaven. There remain then of Matthew vi. but the two verses 22, 23, *The lamp of the body is the eye*, and verse 24, *No man can serve two masters, etc.*, and these two sections occur in Luke, but in different places, xi. 34-36, and xvi. 13, respectively.

MATT. vi. 22, 23.

Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός. εἰ οὖν ἡ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτινὸν ἔσται· εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρὸς ἦ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτινὸν ἔσται. εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος πόσον.

LUKE xi. 34-36.

Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου. ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς ᾖ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτινὸν ἐστίν· ἐπὶ δὲ πονηρὸς ᾖ, καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτινόν. σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν. εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτινόν, μὴ ἔχον μέρος τι σκοτινόν, ἔσται φωτινόν ὅλον ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ φωτίζη σε.

Here the coincidence in the words ἀπλοῦς, φωτινόν, πονηρός seems to me to prove that both Evangelists are drawing from the same Greek original, and I do not think the variations in Luke exceed the liberty to which St Luke, as an independent reporter, might regard himself entitled. The place of the saying in Luke is suggested by the saying about not putting the λύχνος under the bushel, a saying which has a natural place in Matthew, but comes in irrelevantly in Luke.

MATT. vi. 24.

Οὐδεὶς δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεῖν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἓνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ ἐνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει· οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεῖν καὶ μαμωνᾷ.

LUKE xvi. 13.

Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεῖν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἓνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ ἐνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει. οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεῖν καὶ μαμωνᾷ.

Here there is not merely resemblance of thought, but the identity of language is such as to convince us, not merely that the two Evangelists drew from the same source, but that that source must have been in Greek. I know no reason why we should think this common source to have been different from Q, to which we have

already ascribed things common to Matthew and Luke. The only difference is that St Luke inserts the noun *οἰκέτης* which might easily have been added for greater exactness of language, but not have been omitted if it had been in the original.

MATT. vi. 25.

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε [ἢ τί πίνητε], μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσθηθε· οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἐστὶ τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος;

LUKE xii. 22.

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι [ὑμῶν] τί ἐνδύσθηθε. ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἐστὶν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος.

These passages seem also copies from the same Greek original. If there were nothing else, it would not occur to independent writers to make food and drink a matter which concerned the *ψυχὴ*, and raiment the body.

SECTION VII.—CONDUCT, DANGERS.

MATT. vii.

When the two sections peculiar to Matthew are left out there remains a quantity of matter common to Matthew and Luke, and with so much general agreement in respect of order as to lead me to believe that Q had in this place a shorter discourse which formed the basis of the Sermon in our two Gospels. The precept *Judge not*, with which this chapter begins, is found in a different order in Luke. Here it begins a new subject, and has no connexion with what goes before; in Luke it is joined to the precept found also in Matt. v. 48 concerning the imitation of our Father in goodness, irrespective of the merits of its objects. The clause which follows, *With what measure ye mete*, may be safely referred to Q; for it is found not only in Matt. vii. 2, Luke vi. 38, but also in Mark iv. 24; and there, not as a part of a discourse, but with an *ἐλεγεν*, as an independent saying of our Lord. Its connexion in Matthew with the precept *Judge not* is obvious enough. It is part of the general rule of

reciprocity. Then follows, in close connexion, the section about the mote and the beam: if you are sharp-sighted to see your neighbour's faults, do not be surprised if he detects greater faults in you. This clause about the mote and the beam is much more loosely connected in Luke (vi. 41, 42). St Luke, as has been said, brings the precept about giving under the general rule of reciprocity: give, and give liberally, and you will meet even a greater return. St Luke enlarges more than St Matthew on the duty of almsgiving; but this was a common topic with the later Jewish writers.

The saying reported by St Matthew in vii. 6, *Give not that which is holy unto the dogs*, has no obvious connexion with its context, nor has it any parallel in the other Gospels. Possibly Matt. xv. 26 may be cited in connexion with it. If it had been a Jewish habit to regard the Gentile nations as dogs, the application of the word seems to have been inverted in the Church community. See Phil. iii. 2; Rev. xxii. 15.

The following section in Matthew (vv. 7-11) *Ask, and it shall be given you* appears in Luke (xi. 9) as part of the instruction given by our Lord when He taught His disciples His Prayer.

The Golden Rule (Matt. vii. 12) is an enunciation of the general principle of reciprocity, though in St Luke's record of it (vi. 31) it is placed out of this connexion. It has been often remarked that this rule as given by our Lord, of doing to our neighbour what we should wish him to do to us, goes beyond the merely negative form in the Book of Tobit, iv. 15 (*What thou thyself hatest, do to no man*), to abstain from doing to our neighbour what we should not wish him to do to us. In the requirements to be demanded from Gentile converts, as prescribed in the Apostolic letter, Acts xv. 29, this precept is included in its negative form, according to a text which had some circulation in the West, which we know through a citation by Irenæus, *Hær.* iii., xii., 14 (p. 199) and

Cyprian, *Testim.* iii. 119; and the reading is found in Cod. D. It appears also in the same form in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, chapter i., a work which I conjecture to have been founded on a manual which had been used before our Lord's time for the instruction of Gentile converts to Judaism.

Enter ye in by the narrow gate. Matt. vii. 13, 14.

This saying is not given by St Luke as part of the present discourse, but it appears, xiii. 24, as part of our Lord's answer to the question, *Are they few that be saved?* In our Lord's answer, St Luke combines three other sayings of our Lord, of which St Matthew has made a different use. In the first place, we have the saying now under consideration, *Strive to enter in by the narrow door*; then there is the parable which seems to have contained the germ of the parable of the Ten Virgins, which tells how those who came after the master of the house had shut the door, were repulsed with the disclaimer, *I know you not whence ye are.* To this we have also a parallel in the present chapter, vii. 21-23. Thirdly we have the saying which St Matthew has appended to the story of the healing of the centurion's servant. See p. 156.

Beware of false prophets. Deeds not words. Matt. vii. 15-27.

The warning against false prophets is given again in the final apocalyptic discourse in Matthew xxiv. and Mark xiii. It may be doubted whether it has its proper place here. Certainly Matt. vii. 22 seems to belong to a later stage of our Lord's ministry. It is directed against professedly Christian preachers, who even worked miracles in our Lord's name, and we can scarcely think of such preachers as being in activity at the time of our Lord's first sermon.

The phrase, *ravening wolves* seems to be attested by Acts xx. 29, where, however, instead of λύκοι ἄρπαγες, we have λύκοι βαρῆς.

MATT. vii. 16a, 20.

Ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώ-
σεσθε αὐτούς . . . ἄραγε ἀπὸ τῶν
καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.

LUKE vi. 44a.

Ἐκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου
καρποῦ γινώσκεται.

Luke here has the idea in common but not the words.

MATT. vii. 16b.

Μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν
σταφυλὰς ἢ ἀπὸ τριβύλων σῦκα;

LUKE vi. 44b.

Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν
σῦκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυ-
γώσιν.

Compare also James iii. 12 :

Μὴ δύναται, ἀδελφοί μου, συκὴ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι ἢ ἄμπελος σῦκα;

It seems probable that the substance of our Lord's saying had been so often repeated in hortatory discourses that the wording received some modification.

MATT. vii. 17, 18.

Οὕτω πᾶν δένδρον ἀγα-
θὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ,
τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν δένδρον καρ-
ποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ· οὐ
δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν
καρποὺς πονηροὺς ἐνεργεῖν,
οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν καρ-
ποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν.

MATT. xii. 33.

Ἡ ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον
καλὸν καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐ-
τοῦ καλόν, ἢ ποιήσατε τὸ
δένδρον σαπρὸν καὶ τὸν
καρπὸν αὐτοῦ σαπρὸν· ἐκ
γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον
γινώσκεται.

LUKE vi. 43.

Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν δένδρον κα-
λὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν,
οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν
ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν.

MATT. vii. 19; MATT. iii. 10; LUKE iii. 9.

Πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

MATT. vii. 21.

Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κύριε,
εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν
οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ
πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

LUKE vi. 46.

Τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε, κύριε, καὶ
οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;

MATT. vii. 24.

Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς
λόγους [τούτους] καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς,
ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ, ὅστις
ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν
πέτραν.

LUKE vi. 47, 48a.

Πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με καὶ
ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων καὶ ποιῶν
αὐτούς, ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι ἔστιν
ὁμοίος· ὁμοίος ἔστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκο-
δομῶντι οἰκίαν ὃς ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβά-
θυνεν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμελίον ἐπὶ τὴν
πέτραν.

MATT. vii. 25.

Καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθαν οἱ
ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ
προσέπεσαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ
ἔπεσεν, τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν
πέτραν.

LUKE vi. 48b.

Πλημύρης δὲ γενομένης προσέ-
ρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ
οὐκ ἔσχυνεν σαλευσθαι αὐτὴν διὰ τὸ
καλῶς οἰκοδομηθῆσαι αὐτήν.

This last is the reading of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., but the later witnesses have the same conclusion as Matthew. St Luke, however, had given a fuller account than St Matthew of the care taken in building the house.

MATT. vii. 26, 27.

Καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους
τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς ὁμοιωθή-
σεται ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ, ὅστις ὠκοδόμησεν
αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον. καὶ
κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθαν οἱ ποταμοὶ
καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέ-
κοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἔπεσεν,
καὶ ἦν ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.

LUKE vi. 49.

Ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας ὁμοίος
ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι οἰκίαν
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου, ἣ προσέ-
ρηξεν ὁ ποταμός, καὶ εὐθὺς συνέπεσεν,
καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκεί-
νης μέγα.

One cannot speak confidently on the result of a comparison, on which different readers will be apt to form different opinions; but the impression on my mind is that St Luke had heard the discourse related in the form in which St Matthew has preserved it, and was repeating it in his own words, rather than that he was using a different authority, oral or written.

THE HEALING OF THE LEPER

MATT. viii. 1.

Καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.

I return now to take up St Mark's order.

We have to consider the time and place of this miracle. In the above verse St Matthew places it in immediate connexion with the Sermon on the Mount; and though this verse does not authorise us to suppose, as some have taken it, that our Lord met this man on the way down, yet it is clearly intended to represent the occurrence as posterior to that discourse, and as having taken place not earlier than one of the progresses made by our Lord after He had come down. On the other hand, St Mark (i. 40) tells this story immediately after what he has related of our Lord's visit to Capernaum, on the occasion of Peter's call, and leads us to believe that it took place before He returned to that city. St Luke has been following St Mark's order all through the section we have hitherto treated; but having materials for giving a fuller account of the call of Peter than St Mark had done, St Luke omits to tell the story of Peter's call in St Mark's place, but takes the first convenient opportunity of relating the fuller account which had come into his possession, and then returns to take up the thread of St Mark's narrative. And St Luke places the discourse which corresponds to St Matthew's Sermon on the Mount at a later position in his history than that of the healing of this leper.

It will appear on consideration that there is no difference between the Evangelists as to the place

of this miracle, but rather as to that of the Sermon on the Mount, if indeed there is any as to that. It happens to be one of the first things related at length by St Matthew after the call of the first four Apostles; but the last three verses of his fourth chapter relate in general terms our Lord's preaching tour in Galilee, the extension of His fame throughout all Syria, and the gathering of multitudes to Him, not only from Galilee, but from Jerusalem and from Judæa, from Decapolis and from beyond Jordan. It is while pressed by these multitudes that He is represented as going up into a mountain, and delivering the discourse recorded in Matt. v.-vii. There is therefore no disagreement between the Evangelists as to the period of our Lord's life when this miracle was performed. If there is any difference, it is only as to the place in the Gospel where a specimen of our Lord's teaching might be most conveniently inserted.

St Mark does not name the place of the healing of this leper; but it would seem to be one of the towns which Jesus visited in His Galilean tour; and this seems to have been so understood by St Luke, who says that the miracle took place *in one of the cities*. Though this miracle is related by all three Evangelists, yet there are features in St Mark's account which do not appear in the other two; and I believe that careful examination shows that St Luke is not here copying Mark, but drawing from Q. I consider that we have in this example an excellent illustration of three stages in the narration of a Gospel story — We have in St Matthew's Gospel the account of this miracle nearly as it had been given in Q, viii. 1 being inserted by the Evangelist merely to connect it with his previous subject, the Sermon on the Mount. In St Mark's Gospel we have the story as told in Q, reproduced with additions derived from an authentic source by the second Evangelist. In Luke we have a combination of Q with St Mark's account.

MARK i. 40.

Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν
λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν
[καὶ γονυπετῶν] λέγων
αὐτῷ ὅτι, 'Ἐάν θέλῃς δύν-
ασαι με καθαρίσαι.

MATT. viii. 2.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προ-
σελθὼν προσεκύνη αὐ-
τῷ λέγων, Κύριε, ἐάν
θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθα-
ρίσαι

LUKE v. 12.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι
αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπ-
ρας· ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν
πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδε-
ήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων, Κύριε,
ἐάν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθα-
ρίσαι.

The initial formula *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, being common to Matthew and Luke, may reasonably be supposed to have been derived from Q. It is certainly a formula not likely to be used by a Greek author who was not familiar with Hebrew forms of speech.

While St Matthew and St Mark represent the leper as *coming* to our Lord, we should rather take St Luke's account to be that the man saw our Lord as He passed.

Προσεκύνη.—Q has stated in general terms that the leper began with an act of reverence. St Luke specifies what the act was, the man *fell on his face*. St Mark also, according to the Received Text, represents him as kneeling; but, according to B and other documents, mostly Western, St Mark has no equivalent to *προσεκύνη*. In any case the omission was supplied in Church recitation by the insertion of the word *γονυπετῶν*, which passed into the Sinaitic manuscript and other good authorities. I do not think that this addition was known to St Luke, who supplies the omission in a different way. His use of Mark is such that though he might have felt himself quite free to substitute a definite word for the vague *προσεκύνη*, I do not believe he would have dissented, if he had known that St Mark had supplied the omission in a different way. I have my doubts, however, whether St Mark's omission of the word *προσεκύνη* might not have been intentional; for his whole narrative gives me the impression that he had information which led him to take a more unfavourable view of this applicant than the account in Q suggests.

Κύριε.—I count it as a fact leading in the same direction that this respectful form of address, which,

being attested both by Matthew and Luke, we must suppose to have been found in Q, is omitted by St Mark.

MARK i. 41, 42.

Καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκ-
τείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ
ἤψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ,
Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ
εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθερίσθη.

MATT. viii. 3.

Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν
χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ
λέγων, Θέλω, καθαρί-
σθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθε-
ρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.

LUKE v. 13.

Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα
ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων, Θέλω,
καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως
ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ'
αὐτοῦ.

σπλαγχνισθείς.—Instead of this word there is some Western authority for *ὀργισθείς* which Westcott and Hort have counted as sufficient to justify them in putting this reading in their margin. In any case it bears witness to the unfavourable impression of this applicant which Mark's account conveys. Nor is this impression removed by the acceptance of the much better attested reading. Whatever cause for displeasure there was, it did not check the impulse of compassion which the sight of the man's misery excited. St Luke's *ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* is St Mark's phrase, not that of Q.

MARK i. 43, 44.

Καὶ ἐμβριμώμενος αὐ-
τῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν,
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ορα μη-
δενὶ μηδὲν εἶπης, ἀλλὰ
ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ
ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ
τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἃ προ-
σέταξεν Μωυσῆς εἰς μαρ-
τύριον αὐτοῖς.

MATT. viii. 4.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ
Ἰησοῦς, "Ορα μηδενὶ
εἶπης, ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε
σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ,
καὶ προσένεγκον τὸ
δῶρον ὃ προσέταξεν
Μωυσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον
αὐτοῖς.

LUKE v. 14.

Καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν
αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ
ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν
τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε
περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου
καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωυσῆς
εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

This is the conclusion of the story as told by St Matthew. St Mark goes on to tell that the healed leper did not obey this injunction to silence, but published abroad the matter so as to bring a troublesome pressure of crowds about the Saviour's teaching. We might regard this as resulting from an irrepressible impulse of gratitude; yet it does not seem as if St Mark entirely approved of the man's conduct. Else why should he go out of his way to accentuate the

strictness of the command to silence by using the word ἐμβριμησάμενος, which certainly the R.V. margin does not express too strongly by rendering *sternly charged him*, and which probably suggested the ὀργισθεῖς of the Western copy. Possibly we may ascribe it to the influence of Mark that St Matthew uses this same word (ix. 30), in recording a similar injunction of silence by our Lord.

We might be still more tempted to take an unfavourable view of the man's conduct by what follows, εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν, which the A.V. has rendered *forthwith sent him away*. The R.V. has *straightway sent him out*; but if we had been translating for ourselves, we might have been tempted to render *immediately turned him out*. The word *out*, however, it will be observed, appears in the R.V., and the question is whether we are to lay stress on it, for it would suggest that the leper did not come into contact with our Lord through seeing Him pass by the way, but was in the same building with Him. Our first impression is that we cannot disregard this adverb, for St Mark goes on to say ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν, which probably had weight with the translators of the R.V. Weiss imagined that the leper accosted our Lord in the synagogue, which raises the question, Were lepers admitted into the synagogue? Had not the Jews a law of isolation, which we find exemplified in the case of the ten lepers, whom St Luke describes as *standing afar off*? The other explanation would be that this man pushed his way into the house where our Lord and His disciples found a lodging. In that case we can well understand that his intrusion might be resented.

His address to our Lord is capable of a double interpretation. We commonly understand it as nothing more than a cry of humble faith meeting an immediate response. Yet if it had been that, we should have expected that our Lord, as in some other cases, would have given some word of commendation of the suppliant's faith; but none such is found. And his words

might be taken, not as a compliment, but as a reproach : *I believe you could cure me if you liked, why do you not ?* If this man were guilty of rudeness, our Lord excuses it through compassion for the greatness of his need, and will not refuse His healing power. He tells him that He *has* the will, and bids him be clean ; words immediately followed by their effect. But He will not sanction his unauthorised breach of legal restrictions. He must strictly comply with law, and not behave as if he were clean, until pronounced to be so by proper authority, after due inspection.

MARK i. 45.

Ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίσειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι φανερώς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἔξω ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις [ἦν]· καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.

LUKE v. 15, 16.

Διήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶν· αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσευχόμενος.

There is nothing corresponding to this verse in Matthew ; and it would be natural to think that this addition was made by St Mark from a source of information different from Q, and that St Luke had copied Mark. Yet we must notice how little of St Mark's language he has retained ; and the question arises, whether St Luke may not be following something in Q which St Mark has omitted. Yet on examining St Luke's concluding verse, I come to the conclusion that St Luke has followed Mark, but made some designed alteration. It appears to me that St Luke was unable to accept St Mark's unfavourable opinion of the healed leper, of whom the earlier account in Q had led him to think of as a disciple of unusual faith. Instead of telling that the pressure on our Lord arose from this man's disobedience, he attributes no blame to him, but merely says that the thing became noised abroad. St Mark had told that the result of this pressure was that our Lord became unable to show Himself in a town, and was forced to retire to ἐρήμοις τόποις, by which I understand ground unoccupied either by houses or

tillage, whither those followed Him who desired to obtain help from Him. St Luke gives a somewhat different idea by omitting the word *τόποις*; and he describes our Lord's retirement, not as an effort to escape pressure, but merely by way of contrast, that our Lord was constantly in solitary places for the purpose of praying, as related in Mark i. 35. The story as told by St Mark hangs continuously together; St Luke's version gives me the idea of being patched up, so as to bring in several of Mark's words without adopting his version of the story.

THE CENTURION'S SERVANT

MATT. viii. 5-13.

LUKE vii. 1-10.

This narrative is one which we are tempted to refer to the source Q, since it is not found in Mark. If so, its place seems to come here, since in Luke it comes immediately after the discourse which answers to Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, while in Matthew also it closely follows that Sermon, there being nothing interposed but the miracle of the healing of the leper, which we have just considered.

When we compare the two accounts of this occurrence we do not get the impression of the work of two writers using the same document, but rather that of two persons who had learnt a real incident through different channels. In the present case, our two authorities both lay the scene at Capernaum, and they agree completely in the essential point—namely, the answer of the centurion declining our Lord's visit, which is almost verbally the same in both; but elsewhere the language and the small details are different. It is a trifle that St Matthew calls the servant *παῖς*, and St Luke *δοῦλος*, though both have *δοῦλος* when the centurion says, *I say unto my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.* St Matthew says that the

servant was *sick of the palsy, grievously tormented*; St Luke, that he was *sick and at the point of death*. We may note how precarious is an argument founded on a supposed preference for favourite forms of expression. It would have seemed to us more natural if the accounts of Matthew and Luke had been transposed. The phrase *κακῶς ἔχων* occurs several times in Matthew and Mark, but only once elsewhere in Luke; while, if it had been St Luke who avoided it here, we might have ascribed it to his medical knowledge that he preferred to state particularly what the disease was. The most important difference between the two accounts is that St Matthew makes the centurion address our Lord in person, while St Luke makes him send messages through friends: first through Jewish friends, requesting Jesus to come, and afterwards through other friends, declining the visit. It would be tedious to enumerate other differences which only affect forms of expression; for, as far as the substance of the story is concerned, the agreement is wonderfully close. But I own that these differences are less easily accounted for by the supposition that St Luke more accurately reported their common authority, than that he was in possession of fuller information.

At first sight St Matthew's account seems to have the advantage of simplicity. It tells that our Lord when asked to heal the sick man promised to go, but that the excessive honour was at once declined by the centurion. St Luke's account gives us the impression that the centurion at first sent a message asking our Lord to visit his house, and then sent a second message declining the visit; and it does not appear why he should have changed his mind. But we have the explanation in details which St Luke alone gives. The first set of messengers consisted of Jews; and St Luke gives reasons why this centurion enjoyed great popularity with that people. It is when the centurion hears that these messengers had obtained the promise of a visit from Jesus, that he sends friends of his own giving reasons

why the visit was unnecessary. It seems to me that this was so very natural, as to warrant us in concluding that we have here the account of a real occurrence. Imagine an English colonel in India who had made himself popular among the natives by his goodness to them, and in particular by a bountiful gift of money for the erection of their temple. He is known to be in great anxiety on account of the illness of a favourite servant. His native friends sympathise with his trouble, and some of the most influential of them announce to him that they are bringing to his house a miracle-working holy man, who will pray over the sick man and restore him to health. What answer would an English officer be more likely to make than, "The holy man proposes to do me quite too much honour; tell him that I will not ask him to trouble himself to visit my humble abode; assure him that I am persuaded his prayers will be as effectual outside my house as in it."

The story thus told bears so great a stamp of truth that I have only one difficulty in holding that we have here a piece of absolutely contemporaneous history. That difficulty is the formidable one that our Lord is represented as accepting the centurion's answer, not as a refusal softened by extreme courtesy, but as dictated by humble faith. To this two things may be said. One is that this more favourable view may have been the truth. Our Lord could see the hearts, and might know that the suppliant possessed more faith than his mere words would guarantee. Yet it may well be doubted with how much real faith he can be credited. We may reasonably believe that we should have been told of it more fully if a Roman centurion had thus early become a disciple of our Lord; and yet, how could he stop short of becoming a disciple, if he really had the faith in Jesus which his words profess? But when we examine our Lord's words, we find that His commendation was bestowed, not on the man, but on his faith: "This is the kind of faith that you all ought to have, and which I do not find in any of you; faith not resting on

outward signs, nor supposing the Divine to be subject to limitations of place." It was true doctrine, though at that time not generally acknowledged, that the efficacy of faithful prayer was the same, whether it was offered in one place or another ; and true also, that One supreme over all the forces of nature was entitled to exact as implicit obedience as an earthly officer, though himself a subordinate, may require from those subject to his authority.

On the whole, while I have no difficulty in admitting that the details which St Luke has preserved as to the relations of this centurion with the Jewish people may not have been recorded in Q, which probably means that they did not form part of the narrative orally recited in some churches, yet I consider that St Luke's additions must be regarded as authentic, and as representing the story as recited by some one with fuller knowledge of the facts.

But perhaps it may be asked, How is it that Mark gives us no help here ; for he omits altogether to tell of this occurrence ? To answer this we must consider in what sense St Mark can fairly be described as an abridger. Certainly not in his treatment of particular narratives, which repeatedly give us the impression, not that he has abridged the relations of the other Evangelists, but that they have abridged his. But, as regards the selection of incidents for narration, St Mark certainly is an abridger ; for he leaves out much that the other Evangelists have told, and in several cases we can give no better reason for the omission than that to relate them would have enlarged his book beyond the limits he had prescribed for himself. Mr J. Rendel Harris has a theory as to the conventional limits which, in the first century, were put to the size of a book ; but we have only to bear in mind what St John says at the end of his Gospel, as to the impossibility of writing an absolutely complete account of our Lord's life and work, when we must feel that the mass of authentic materials with which St Mark

had to deal must have been so great that selection must have been a necessity. Thus when he attempted to throw into the form of a book the history he had been accustomed to deliver in a series of weekly recitations, he might feel himself unable to include everything; and it is quite possible that St Mark's Gospel may be a much shorter book than a *verbatim* report of his own oral instruction would have been. Nor should I even pronounce it impossible that St Mark might have given orally an account of the incident we are considering, quite as long as that given by St Luke.

MATT. viii. 11, 12.

Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἤξουσιν καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

LUKE xiii. 28, 29.

Ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, ὅταν ἔψῃσθε Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφῆτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω. καὶ ἤξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Here I can feel no doubt that the sayings in Matthew and in Luke have a common original; and we are enabled to judge what liberties the Evangelists thought themselves at liberty to take, both as to the matter and the arrangement. In the present example, I regard Matthew, as far as the matter is concerned, to be likely to be nearer the common original than Luke. Where Matthew has *Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob*, Luke adds *and all the prophets*; where Matthew has *the East and the West*, Luke adds *the North and the South*. If the fuller had been the original, it would not have been likely to have been shortened, but the shorter form might very conceivably have been lengthened for the sake of completeness. It is otherwise with the arrangement of the narrative. St Luke places this saying at a somewhat late period in our Lord's ministry, St Matthew at its very commencement; and St Luke's arrangement seems the more probable. For the doctrine taught in this verse is not merely the admission of Gentiles into the Messiah's Kingdom, but their admis-

sion to the exclusion of the bulk of the Jews from privileges which they did not value; and we should not expect this exclusion to have been announced by our Lord until after the Jews of most authority and influence had rejected His teaching. So when we find St Matthew recording this saying as uttered on the occasion of the healing of the centurion's servant, and St Luke recording that miracle without this addition, but inserting this saying later in a separate place, we conclude that it had not been joined to the miracle in the common authority used by the two Evangelists; and we gather that St Matthew arranged our Lord's sayings less with a view to representing their chronological sequence than with the desire to place together those of kindred nature.

THE PARALYTIC MAN

Mark ii. 1-12.

Matt. ix. 1-8.

Luke v. 17-26.

I return now to follow the order of St Mark's Gospel; and we find here a decisive proof that the three Synoptic Gospels must have had a common original. For the second chapter, at which we have now arrived, contains three sections which have no natural connexion with each other—the healing of the paralytic man, the calling the publican to be a follower of our Lord, and the question about fasting—these three sections being found in the same order in all three Synoptics. This could not be a chance coincidence: either one was followed by the other two, or all three drew from a common source.

St Mark fixes definitely for us the time and place of this miracle. He had told in his first chapter how the miracle performed by our Lord in the synagogue brought on the Sabbath evening a crowd round the door, how He rose early next morning and retired to

a solitary place, and when His disciples sought Him there, He refused to return, but took the disciples with Him on a preaching tour round Galilean towns and villages. We are now told of His return to Capernaum on the completion of this tour. When the crowds hear of His arrival, they assemble again in such numbers as not only to fill the house where He was teaching, but so to collect round the door as to make access difficult, and to oblige those who wished to bring the paralytic man into His presence to let him down through the roof.

Comparing now, in the first instance, Mark and Luke, we find nothing in the latter that is not stated, or at least suggested, in the former. St Luke's variations are not substantial, but merely give the story a more literary form. St Luke does not state where or at what time the incident occurred; he merely says that it was *on one of those days*, a phrase which seems suggested by Mark's *δι' ἡμερῶν*. The very early place in his Gospel which St Luke gives this narrative would seem to indicate that he did not mean to differ from Mark as to the period in our Lord's life when this miracle was wrought. But St Luke's description of our Lord's audience would lead us to refer this story to a later time than is suggested by St Mark's narrative. St Mark tells that some of our Lord's audience were shocked by His pronouncement of forgiveness of sins, though they did not venture to express their feelings in words. He describes these critical hearers as *scribes who were sitting there*. St Luke retains Mark's *καθήμενοι*, and describes the murmurers as *Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι* who had come from *every village of Galilee and Judæa and Jerusalem*.

Here I must say that my conviction of the priority of St Mark's Gospel does not depend on the autoptic touches to which many critics have called attention, but on the fact that if we desire to know anything of the gradual process, by which, as the fame of Jesus spread, the enthusiasm of His disciples mounted, and

the apprehensions and jealousy of those who did not believe in Him were roused, it is from Mark only we can obtain satisfactory information. In this Gospel alone I recognise information coming from one of the first generation of disciples, who could remember the early struggles; in the other two Synoptics the early background is obscured by the glory of subsequent successes. In the present case St Luke's picture is no doubt true of a later period. We find that when the Baptist's preaching gained notoriety, Pharisees and other emissaries came from Jerusalem to ascertain the doctrines of this new teacher; and so it would be likely also to happen when our Lord's teaching had gained similar notoriety. But on the occasion of which St Mark here tells, our Lord made an unexpected appearance in Capernaum, after an absence of some little time. It is scarcely likely that the authorities at Jerusalem could have known that His return was expected, and could already have arranged to have representatives to meet Him. I think then that it is plain that St Mark means us to understand the scribes, of whom he tells, as men habitually resident at Capernaum; while St Luke has coloured his description by touches derived from what was known of a later period of the ministry of Jesus. And this change in St Luke's conception of the situation leads to a further change in his account of what took place. It might have been expected that our Lord's pronouncement of forgiveness of sins would give a shock to the feelings of some of those who were present; and it probably required no supernatural knowledge to perceive that it had actually done so; but St Mark describes those who disapproved as only *reasoning in their hearts*, but not as venturing to give expression to their feelings in words. The dissentients were no doubt in a minority in that assembly; for the act of those who brought the palsied man shows how great had then become belief in the wonder-working power of Jesus. But emissaries come down from Jerusalem, for the purpose

of criticising, would not yield such deference to local opinion; and accordingly St Luke makes them put into words what in Matthew and Mark had been merely a report of their thoughts: ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες κ.τ.λ. yet he retains Mark's version of our Saviour's rebuke, τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.

Except in the point on which we have been now commenting, St Luke makes no substantial change in St Mark's narrative. His changes being only in form of expression may all be described as mere literary variations, and none of them obliges us to suppose that he is copying a source different from Mark.

It may be doubted, however, whether St Luke, in his desire to remove an inelegance of language, has not made a substantial change in the story. St Mark had said nothing about tiles, though such mention was necessary according to St Luke's conception of what had taken place. But as far as St Mark's relation was concerned, we might suppose the scene of the incident to have been the inner court of the house, which had been covered with sailcloth as a protection against the sun, and that the sick man's bearers did no more than partially uncover the court, and let down their burden from above.

One proof of St Luke's indebtedness to Mark may be mentioned here, though it might be deferred till I come to speak of Matthew with whom St Luke has this feature in common. Notwithstanding all variations between the three accounts—Mark's, Luke's and Matthew's—they have one common feature so remarkable that the evidence of common origin is irresistible. In telling of our Lord's final answer to those who murmured at His pretensions to forgive sins, all three pack into one speech His address to the murmurers and to the sick man. He addresses the objectors, *That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins*—and then breaking off, gives His proof, not by words, but by deed; and turning to the paralytic

says, *Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house.* This parenthetic λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ occurs in all three Gospels [εἶπεν, Luke], and it is certainly incredible that three different writers should by accident agree in telling the story in this dramatic way.

We must first notice a discrepancy, which is only apparent, between Matthew and Mark as to the place of the miracle. St Mark places it at Capernaum, and is followed by St Luke; St Matthew says that it was in our Lord's *οἰκῇ* city, a phrase which might suggest to us Nazareth; but this is clearly not what the Evangelist intended, and we have the explanation in Matt. iv. 13, where the Evangelist tells that our Lord, when He left Nazareth, came to reside in Capernaum.

As for the time of the incident, St Matthew is at variance with St Mark, placing it after our Lord's return from the country of the Gadarenes, which St Mark does not relate till his fifth chapter. Possibly St Matthew followed the order in which the story was told in Q. On looking more closely into St Matthew's account, we are at once struck by his omission of particulars which it is hardly conceivable that any one could leave out who was using Mark as his authority. St Matthew's coincidences with the other Gospels do not begin until the sick man is brought into our Lord's presence. It is not told how he had been brought in; and nothing is said of the crowd about the door, nor of the expedient which the bearers had to use in order to get the paralytic into the house. Indeed one could not tell from the first Gospel that the transaction took place within a house at all.

The translators of St Mark's Gospel have been puzzled how to render his expression ἡκούσθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν. If they render ἐν οἴκῳ *in the house*, the reader asks, In what house? for none had been particularly mentioned; if, with the R. V. margin, we render it *at home*, we take it on ourselves to decide the question, whether the house here spoken of could properly be described as *the home* of Jesus. There are some who

imagine that our Lord owned a house of His own at Capernaum; and if it was one capable of being the scene of the incident here described, it must have been a tolerably large one. We cannot give absolute proof either way, but to me the probabilities are adverse to the supposition. We have no reason to think of our Lord as wanting a large house for the purpose of His trade, at which there is no evidence that He worked after He became a preacher. It seems to be only at Nazareth that He was remembered as *the carpenter*. Capernaum seems to have been with Him no more than a centre for missionary tours; and we may believe that He followed the rule, which He prescribed to those whom He Himself sent out, of accepting in each place such hospitality as might be offered. According to this rule, it would seem most natural to understand the house spoken of as Peter's, into which we know He entered immediately after the meeting of the synagogue; but, as I have already remarked, probably not before that meeting, else he would have been told sooner of the illness of His host's mother-in-law.

The account in Matthew seems to have been taken from an authority which made no mention of a house; and the singular feature in this miraculous cure would seem to have been only that, whereas other such people brought to Him had been able, at least with assistance, to come on their own legs, this man was so completely paralysed that he had to be brought lying down, bed and all, whereupon he received the command, *Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk*. Yet from this point out, St Matthew takes up St Mark's narrative, and indeed St Matthew's next verse is hardly intelligible without St Mark's explanation. St Matthew had told in the vaguest way that the palsied man had been brought to Christ, without telling by whom, *προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικόν*; yet he goes on to say, *and Jesus seeing their faith said, etc.* It would have been in accordance with the accounts of other miracles, if we had been told something of the sick man's faith, or at least how his

bearers manifested theirs, but for this information we are dependent upon Mark. And as we proceed, coincidences with Mark multiply. We have for instance the τέκνον, which St Luke omits, but which in Matthew assumes an even more affectionate form, θάρσει τέκνον. St Matthew mentions the murmuring of the scribes, but does not, like the other two Evangelists, explain how scribes came to be present. St Matthew's variations often present the appearance not so much of an abridgment as of an unskilful rewriting of Mark. Instead of Mark's version of our Lord's address to the scribes: τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; Matthew has ἵνα τί ἐνθυμείσθε πονηρὰ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; Yet it can hardly be called an evil thought that God only can forgive sins.

Notwithstanding the signs of the use of St Mark's Gospel here by St Matthew, there are also tokens of the employment of another source. We have here the phenomenon of agreement between Matthew and Luke, for which Mark will not account, and which I ordinarily take to indicate the use of an independent source Q. For instance, instead of Mark's ἐγείρου καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει (verse 9), Matthew and Luke agree in ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει; instead of Mark's ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων (verse 12), Matthew and Luke agree in ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ; and in the same verse Mark has nothing corresponding either to the οἱ ὄχλοι ἐφοβήθησαν of Matthew, or the ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου of Luke.

On the whole, these coincidences lead me to believe that the story had been told by an authority Q, which was known to St Luke as well as to St Matthew. But I believe that this story was again told by St Mark, with fuller knowledge, and that St Luke made use of St Mark's account. It is a mistake to imagine that the earliest form of the Gospel story must necessarily have been the best. Our Lord lived a public life, and we have not been left to depend on a single witness for our knowledge of Him. However excellent the

first collection of anecdotes of His life may have been, it is very conceivable that it may have been read by some one able to tell some of the story with greater accuracy, or at least with more fulness of detail.

THE CALLING OF THE PUBLICAN

MARK ii. 13, 14.

Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς. Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν Λευεὶν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἀκολούθει μοι. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ.

MATT. ix. 9.

Καὶ παράγων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖθεν εἶδεν ἀνθρώπον καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, Μαθθαῖον λεγόμενον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι· καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ.

LUKE v. 27, 28.

Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευεὶν καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀκολούθει μοι. καὶ καταλιπὼν πάντα ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ.

St Luke here copies Mark's ἐξῆλθεν, a word which Weiss understands as meaning that our Lord then started for a little missionary tour by the borders of the lake, but which, in my opinion, simply means that He went out of the city. We are told that when He went out *all the multitude* followed Him. This would naturally happen when He was only moving to a short distance, but not if He was starting on a long journey.

St Matthew has nothing equivalent to the first verse in St Mark's narrative, but takes up the story with St Mark's second verse, beginning with the word παράγων. This word is used by St Mark in his account of the calling of the two pairs of brothers, but is not there used by St Matthew. A strong suspicion arises that St Matthew is here using Mark, because he agrees with Luke in placing in Mark's order the three incidents recorded in Mark's second chapter. But the question has to be considered whether St Matthew might not have found the story of the calling of the publican related in Q, or some

other early authority; but such little evidence as is afforded by this word παράγων tends in favour of a direct use of Mark by St Matthew; and in what follows there are many verbal coincidences between these two Evangelists which strengthen this conclusion.

In one respect, however, Matthew differs from Mark and Luke. St Mark, followed by St Luke, calls this publican Levi (Mark adds *the son of Alphæus*), but the First Gospel calls him Matthew, and plainly identifies him with one of the Twelve, who in that Gospel only is described as Matthew *the publican*. We cannot doubt that all three Evangelists are here relating the same incident; and they can only be reconciled by the supposition that this disciple was known by both names. And this is no improbable hypothesis. We know from the O.T., that on a man's change, either in position or circumstances, it was not unusual either to give him a new name, or to make some variation in his old one. It is quite in harmony with this, that our Lord, in enlisting Simon as an Apostle, should give him the new name of Cephas. If Levi had been the name by which the publican had been known up to the time of our Lord's call, we have no reason to think that St Mark in his narrative would have here anticipated the use of his second name; for in the parallel case of Simon Peter, St Mark only uses the name Simon, until, when he gives the list of the Twelve, he records that our Lord gave Simon the surname of Peter. There would have been no difficulty in this case if it were not that St Mark, after the present passage, never mentions the name of Levi again; nor in his list of the Twelve does he describe any of them as having been a publican; so that one who had no other Gospel than St Mark's would have been ignorant whether any of the Twelve, or which, was to be identified with this Levi.

Accordingly, some very early writers seem to be ignorant that Levi was the same as Matthew. It is here enough to give one example. Heracleon, a second

century heretic quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 9), in arguing against the opinion that *confessing our Lord before men* was only to be understood of confession before a magistrate, remarks that all οἱ σωζόμενοι had not been *confessors* in the sense to which it was proposed to restrict the word, and he gives as examples *Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others*. From Heracleon's thus quoting Matthew and Levi as distinct persons, we might plausibly infer that Heracleon was not acquainted with St Matthew's Gospel, at least as we have it now, for this Gospel is the sole source of our knowledge that Matthew is to be identified with Levi, but, in my opinion, that Gospel may be regarded as quite sufficient authority.

It seems to me not reasonable to suppose that the call given to Matthew was different in its nature from that given in like terms to Simon and Andrew, James and John. And thus I think that there is good justification for the general opinion of the early Church that as the four disciples just named were afterwards included in the list of the Twelve, Levi must have been one of those entrusted with the same office.

Our three authorities agree in describing the publican as found καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ τελώνιον, an unusual form of expression which seems to me to indicate the use of a common source.

All three Synoptics have the words καὶ ἀναστὰς, for which the previous καθήμενον had prepared us. But St Luke's καταλιπὼν πάντα has no authority from Matthew or Mark, and seems to be an addition of St Luke's own. Not that we need doubt that Levi then gave up his former employment to become a personal attendant on our Lord. But we must know more of the circumstances, before we could pledge ourselves to the popular view that Levi then went after our Lord, leaving behind him the money which he had collected. We do not know whether or not he had partners in the business, or if the money was his own, so that he could abandon it without dishonesty. What follows would lead us to

think that his departure was not very abrupt; for the next thing of which we are told is a feast which he made, at which others in the same employment were present, and it is natural to think that Levi remained long enough to give his invitations. I take the situation of Matthew's toll-house to be close to the principal landing-place from the lake.

THE PUBLICAN'S FEAST

MARK ii. 15-17.

MATT. ix. 10-13.

LUKE v. 29-32.

I have thought myself at liberty to assume that the feast here described took place in Levi's house. It is true that the opinion has been defended that the house was our Lord's own. St Matthew indeed seems to regard our Lord (iv. 13) as a permanent resident in Capernaum. But there is a difference between making Capernaum for a time His centre of operations, and owning a house there. A more plausible conjecture is that the house was that of Simon and Andrew, of which we read in St Mark's first chapter, and which was probably the place where the paralytic was borne by four into our Lord's presence. But however willing Peter and his brother might have been to entertain their Master, it is not likely that they would have extended their hospitality to a large company of tax-collectors. The question, *Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?* would certainly have been put in a different form if addressed to those whose own invitation had collected these discreditable guests. On the other hand, these are exactly the guests who might be expected to be present if the feast were given by Levi. It may be remarked that these tax gatherers were not Gentiles, and that Levi's father, whose name is given, was probably a man well known in Capernaum.

The relation between St Matthew's account and St Mark's is evidently very close, but is not easy to define. That is to say, if we ask, Is St Matthew simply drawing his account from Mark? or are both dependent on a previous account, such as I have called Q? I do not see grounds for a positive affirmation, but my leaning is to the belief that St Matthew has used a previous authority.

That St Luke in this narrative follows Mark seems to me beyond doubt; for I see no trace that he is using a different authority, even when he varies from Mark. Thus St Mark says that *many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus and his disciples*. We know what is meant by *publicans*, but who were the *sinners*? It seems to me that St Luke felt the difficulty of this question, and evades it by saying, *publicans and others*. St Mark adds, *for there were many, and they followed him*. We ask ourselves, Does the Evangelist mean that Levi included in his invitation all the crowd who are spoken of as following Jesus from the town? St Luke leaves out the whole difficult clause.

St Luke represents the question put to the disciples as, *Why do ye eat and drink with the publicans and sinners?* yet our Lord's answer is more appropriate to the question as reported by St Matthew, *Why cateth¹ your Master with the publicans and sinners?* Persons may have been present at this *great reception*, *δοχή*, who were not partakers of the feast; and such appears to have been the case with the feast related in Luke vii. 36. But when we are told that our Lord was found fault with for eating with *publicans and sinners*, we naturally ask, Are two classes of people spoken of, or only one? The latter is the general impression that we all receive. The idea that occurs to us is that if the men were publicans, they were of necessity sinners, and that we are not bound to suppose that others of bad character

¹ It may be remarked in passing that critical editors have been sometimes sarcastic at the expense of copyists, who cannot tell of eating without giving the guests also something to drink. But how natural this was appears from St Luke's variation here; for he alters Mark's *eat* into *eat and drink*.

were present. Yet I think that if the statement in this verse originated with St Mark, he would not have stated that publicans *and sinners* sat down with Jesus, unless he had two classes of people in his mind, and that he would then have specified what the second class was. We are told that the Pharisees applied the word *sinner*s to all who disregarded the religious obligations which they held to be binding; and so we could understand a Pharisee describing this company as made up of publicans and other sinners. But would such language be used by St Mark, who probably was, from a Pharisaic point of view, a sinner himself? So I find it more easy to believe that St Mark's authority, which may have been Q, merely reported the charge that our Lord ate with publicans and sinners, and that the necessity of the narrative form obliged our Evangelists to begin by relating that *publicans and sinners* sat down.

I notice now what I ought to have observed before: the evidence afforded by the commencement of the narrative. One cannot but be struck with the Hebraistic character of the beginning of Matthew's account, ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ. For the constant use of ἐγένετο in O.T. narration it is enough to refer to the LXX. version of Gen. iv. 8; vi. 1. St Mark begins this narrative with γίνεταί; St Luke drops the Hebraistic form altogether. I feel therefore that the present is a section which may safely be referred to Q. We know for certain that Q contained a mention that the reproach was made against our Lord that He was *a friend of publicans and sinners*; for this is found in the section absent from Mark, but common to Matthew and Luke, which tells of the message sent by the Baptist to our Lord (Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34).

Certainly at the time that St Luke wrote his Gospel the equivalence of the terms τελώνης and ἁμαρτωλός seems to have established itself (xviii. 13; xix. 7; vi. 32, 34 compared with Matt. v. 46, 47; and xv. 1, 2, compared with the present passage), but it does not follow that this usage was as early as Q. In a passage which we may

reasonably believe to have been derived from Q we find the publicans with a different association, οἱ τελόωναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι (Matt. xxi. 31, 32). On another occasion we find a woman, who was a *sinner*, is described as ministering to our Lord at a feast where He was a guest (Luke vii. 37). The story of the woman taken in adultery (John viii.) illustrates our Lord's known willingness to receive into His society persons of such ill repute that others would have despaired of them as incapable of reformation. What I understand then by *sinner*s is persons notorious for sexual immorality; and this is what I suppose the Pharisees to have intended when they described Him as making His friends of *publicans and sinners*.

The scribes who murmured were no doubt the same as those spoken of in Mark ii. 6, that is to say, not all the scribes, but those of them who were of the sect of the Pharisees. St Luke's description is less accurate, *The Pharisees and their scribes*. The murmurers could scarcely have themselves taken part in the feast. St Luke substitutes for Mark's ἰσχυόντες the more accurate ὑγιαίνοντες; and to the words *I am not come to call the righteous but sinners* he adds, *to repentance*. I can not but think that those who put into our Lord's mouth the words *I am not come* believed in His pre-existence.

There is little in St Matthew's Gospel or in St Luke's which would oblige us to believe that either Evangelist used any authority but Mark, until we come to the quotation from Hosea vi. 6 (Matt. ix. 13). I do not think that St Mark and St Luke would have omitted this quotation here, if they had found it in their authority. St Matthew's Gospel, however, is full of O.T. illustrations of our Lord's history, and he has the same quotation from Hosea soon again (xii. 7) in his account of the murmuring at the conduct of the disciples as they walked through the corn fields. If I am right in admitting the possibility that the story of Levi's feast had been told in Q, doubt is cast on

the inference I have drawn from the identity of the arrangement of the three sections of Mark's second chapter in all three Synoptics, viz., that the other two copied Mark. It is no doubt possible that all three followed the order of Q. As far, however, as St Luke is concerned, I cannot doubt that he here followed Mark.

THE QUESTION ABOUT FASTING

MARK ii. 18-20.

Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ [μαθηταὶ] οὐ νηστεύουσιν; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν νηστεύειν; ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν· ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

MARK ii. 21, 22.

Οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ βλῆμα ῥάκους ἀγράφου ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, αἶρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί. [ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινοὺς.]

MATT. ix. 14, 15.

Τότε προσέρχονται αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου λέγοντες, Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σοῦ οὐ νηστεύουσιν; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος; ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν.

MATT. ix. 16, 17.

Οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ βλῆμα ῥάκους ἀγράφου ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· αἶρει γὰρ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται. οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴγε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοί, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχρεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφοτέροι συντηροῦνται.

LUKE v. 33-35.

Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν, Οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται, ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ποιῆσαι νηστεύσαι; ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος τότε νηστεύουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.

LUKE v. 36-38.

Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι, Οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ βλῆμα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μὴγε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἐπὶ βλῆμα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴγε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινοὺς βλητέον.

Both St Matthew and St Luke connect this question about fasting with the complaint against our Lord for His eating with publicans and sinners. With Matthew indeed, there is but a coincidence in time, indicated by the *τότε* with which this section commences. But in Luke the same persons are represented as making both complaints, *οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν*. Whether Mark also is to be understood in the same sense, depends very much on how we are to translate the *ἦσαν νηστεύοντες* of verse 18. The A. V. gives the impersonal verb a frequentative sense, *used to fast*, a very defensible rendering, if we do not insist on shutting up Mark too rigidly within the limits of the best classical Greek. He himself uses *ἦν* of a habitual state, e.g., *ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος*, i. 6; *ἦν διδάσκων*, i. 22; *ἦν κηρύσσων* i. 39 (T. R.); see also Matt. vii. 29; Luke iv. 31, etc. It certainly appears to me that it was in this sense that St Luke understood Mark; for while he avoids the use of such an ambiguous form as *ἦσαν νηστεύοντες*, he substitutes here an account of the habitual practices in which John's disciples agreed with the Pharisees, such as frequent fasts and many prayers. Possibly he means by the latter the use of forms of prayer.

Notwithstanding, I think we get a more lively conception of the scene, if we understand the Evangelist to say that the Pharisees and John's disciples were at the time keeping fast (so R. V.). And here we have to consider what was the peculiarity of the Pharisaic fasting. It was not that they had a special season of the year, like Lent, for fasting; but, as St Luke gives us to understand (xviii. 12), and we learn from the *Didache*, c. 8, that the days on which they fasted were the second and fifth days of the week. We can understand then that the scribes of the Pharisees who followed our Lord and His disciples to Levi's house did not sit down with the publicans to his feast, it being their fast day. If our Lord had gone out of Capernaum on the first day of the week, the second might have commenced before the hour of the feast.

It could scarcely have been the same persons who first objected to the disciples sitting down in company with publicans, and then objected to their eating at all ; and St Matthew has probably preserved the original account : namely, that those who put the general question about fasting were disciples of the Baptist. There must have been several such among our Lord's disciples, who though they might not have scrupled to sit down in such company, yet continued to observe John's seasons of abstinence.

It is remarkable what a variation St Luke makes in his version of the parable about a patch on an old garment ; and it does not seem to me that he has changed for the better. The idea of the parable in the version of Matthew or Mark seems to be that one would not unite a piece of strong, undressed, cloth to a worn garment ; otherwise when the garment was subjected to any strain, the result would probably be to tear away the patch, and with it a larger piece of the old garment. It would seem to me that St Luke, in reciting the narrative, found the statement that no one would put a patch of new cloth upon an old garment met by the contradiction that this was exactly what every one would do who put on a patch at all. Consequently he altered his version into, no one would tear a piece out of a new garment, to get a patch for an old one. The result would be great damage to the new garment, while the patch would not match the old garment. It now becomes beyond contradiction that nobody would act thus ; but this is so obviously true that the illustration is spoiled.

In Luke we find a verse, 39, added to which there is nothing corresponding in Matthew or Mark, *No man having drunk, etc.* This verse seems to have been absent from the old Western text, yet it has the best Alexandrian attestation. It probably was absent from the first draft of St Luke's Gospel. We find in other cases too that things which do not seem to have belonged to the first edition show traces of this original

defect by some failure of subsequent attestation. This additional verse does not seem very appropriate to the present story, but perhaps was one of the *sayings* put by St Luke where he thought it would fit.

THE WALK THROUGH THE CORN FIELDS

MARK ii. 23-28.

MATT. xii. 1-4, 8.

LUKE, vi. 1-5.

This section is common to all three Synoptics, and Luke has all the appearance of having copied from Mark, whose order of narration he completely follows. In both Gospels this section immediately follows the question about fasting. In St Matthew's Gospel, while the three preceding sections agree with Mark's order, and while the present section is connected with that which follows in the same way as in Mark, this section itself is separated by a considerable interval from that which had preceded.

Luke is in close verbal identity with Mark, and so also is Matthew in those places which he has in common with Mark; but while St Luke has hardly anything that he might not have learnt from Mark, St Matthew makes an important addition to our Lord's answer.

MATT. xii. 5, 6, 7.

Ἡ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι τοῖς σάββασι οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοι εἰσιν; λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων ἐστὶν ὧδε. εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκετε τί ἐστίν, Ἐλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσιάν, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναιτίους.

With regard to this addition we are tempted to ask, What passage in the Law is referred to? It is obvious that the duties of the servers in the Temple included much that could not be properly done elsewhere on the Sabbath, but I think that St Matthew would not have introduced this section of his with

this formula if it had not been a continuation of the previous section of Q.

St Mark's first word gives us a caution against pressing too confidently an argument founded on the use of a single word. In the last section I considered that my suspicion that the section about fasting had been told by Q was confirmed by the Aramaic character of St Matthew's commencement with ἐγένετο, followed by St Mark, who begins with γίνεται; but some doubt is cast on this argument when I observe that St Mark begins the present section with ἐγένετο, which we do not find in Matthew, where we should rather expect it to appear.

However I think that the verses just cited indicate that St Matthew has been using Q; for in a passage which clearly belongs to Q, as absent from Mark but common to Matthew (xii. 41) and Luke (xi. 31), we have πλείον Ἰωνᾶ ὥδε . . . πλείον Σολομῶνος ὥδε. The change from πλείον to μείζον would seem to indicate that St Matthew's language is rather suggested by Q than copied from it. The quotation from Hosea which reappears here, had been used by St Matthew (ix. 13) as part of our Lord's defence for eating with publicans and sinners. But as the order of Mark and Luke shows, that section must have stood in Q in close connexion with the present section, and that quotation may have read so as to be equally applicable to both.

We have also to comment on a remarkable various reading in this section of Luke. According to the majority of the MSS., supported by good patristic testimony, the incident is described as occurring ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ; but the last word is not found in the oldest Alexandrian authorities, nor in some of the Western. The present is a case where the solution we adopt of the Synoptic problem affects a question of reading. The arguments on both sides have been not very unevenly balanced. On the one hand, the retention of the disputed word is recommended by the maxim of preferring the more difficult reading. No

one, ancient or modern, has given an explanation of this adjective, such as can be adopted with any confidence; so that a copyist would be under a strong temptation to omit a word which he did not understand. On the other hand, there is not a particle of confirmatory evidence that any Sabbath was known among the Jews as *the Second-first Sabbath*, and if so strange a name had been in use we might surely have expected to hear of it elsewhere. So that *δευτεροπρώτῳ* seems to be, not only a difficult, but an impossible reading. Hort also contends that the designed omission might occur in a single document, or in a group of restricted ancestry, but not where the omission has attestation of such variety and excellence as in the present case. I do not dispute what he says about the "excellence," but I am not convinced of the "variety"; for it appears to me that in this case B has only its usual allies. But if *δευτεροπρώτῳ* is not genuine, how did that reading originate? Meyer's explanation is the best, that the mention of *another Sabbath* in verse 6 led some scribe to insert here the word *πρώτῳ*, and that a second scribe, observing that St Luke had told of a Sabbath in chapter iv., substituted *δευτέρῳ* in the margin, marking *πρώτῳ* with dots for erasure; but a third transcriber, overlooking the erasure dots, combined the readings of the text and the margin of his autograph into *δευτεροπρώτῳ*. This is a very complicated and lame explanation, and the chief difficulty in accepting it is exactly the great variety of attestation for this strange word. A single transcriber might have so blundered, but how came so many to follow him that towards the end of the fourth century commentators who were puzzled by the phrase attempted in different ways to explain it, but none of them seems to have thought of questioning his text? I may quote Jerome's good story that when he asked Gregory Nazianzen to explain it to him, Gregory, who clearly had not much confidence in his own explanation, answered, I should prefer that you would listen to my explanation when

I give it in Church; you will find that it will be received with so much applause that you will then not have the face to cavil at it.¹

I should be disposed to pronounce the controversy as to the genuineness of this word to have ended in a drawn battle, if it were not for the light which the Synoptic study throws on the matter. If we had come to the conclusion that St Mark was following Luke, we should have no difficulty in deciding that δευτεροπρώτῳ was the genuine text of Luke, and that St Mark had designedly omitted the word. But since I find no reason to think that St Luke here used any authority but Mark, while I could account for his omitting a strange word which he found in Mark, I cannot think it probable that he would have introduced it without Mark's, and, as far as I can see, without any other authority. I therefore reject the word from the text of Luke.

I cannot help taking notice of a reading which has a very slight Old Latin attestation, *Sabbato mane factum est*. *Mane* evidently points to a Greek πρωί which might have been an alternative for πρώτῳ, but not for δευτεροπρώτῳ. This is the best evidence I know in favour of Meyer's theory that the reading δευτεροπρώτῳ had its source in an original πρώτῳ.

THE MAN WITH THE WITHERED HAND

MARK iii. 1-6.

MATT. xii. 9-14.

LUKE vi. 6-11.

In all three Synoptics this section is closely connected with that about the walk through the corn fields. In

¹ Præceptor quondam meus Gregorius Nazianzenus rogatus a me ut exponeret quid sibi vellet in Luca sabbatum δευτεροπρωτον, id est, secundo-primum, eleganter lusit, docebo te, inquit, super hac re in Ecclesia; in qua, mihi omni populo acclamante, cogeris invitus scire quod nescis. Aut certe si solus tacueris, solus ab omnibus stultitiæ condemnaberis, *Epist.* 52, 8.

these two sections St Mark tells us for the first time of the dispute concerning Sabbath observance, on which question the laxity of our Lord's teaching came later (John ix. 16), to be regarded as a principal cause of His rejection by the more religious of the nation. But St Mark's narrative leads us to think that the distrust of our Lord and His teaching felt by the ecclesiastical authorities had an earlier date than the controversy about Sabbath obligation. But we need not go beyond the account which St Mark, in his first chapter, gives of our Lord's first recorded visit to the synagogue at Capernaum, in order to understand the prejudice which lovers of law and order would feel against the irregularities of this new teacher. He had no doubt been seen going about the city followed by crowds of enthusiastic believers in His miraculous power; and now He and they came into the synagogue, and with them a shrieking demoniac. No doubt many would be scandalised at this interruption to the quiet and orderly service of the day, and their feelings would be such as are expressed in St Luke's report (xiii. 14) of the indignant utterance of the ruler of the synagogue on another occasion, *There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the day of the Sabbath.* We can imagine what a parish clergyman of the present day would feel, if a leader of a Salvation Army band brought his followers into Church, and there interrupted the service with an attempt to work a miracle. It was not so much by teaching false doctrine, as by irregularity and insubordination, that Whitfield and Wesley a hundred and fifty years ago, and George Fox a century earlier, stirred up the opposition of the ecclesiastical rulers; though no doubt the irregularity and insubordination made the authorities keen-scented in their suspicion of false doctrine.

There are two questions suggested by St Mark's account. The first is one to which we do not seem under any obligation to attempt an answer: Why did

Jesus bid the diseased man to stand forth in the midst? The other, however, is a point which must be explained, else the story is not intelligible, What was the breach of the Sabbath complained of? Jesus had bid the man stretch forth his hand, and he had done so. How could it be imagined that he broke the Sabbath by such a simple act, or that Jesus had sinned in asking him to do so? Jewish writings have been explored, in order to find out what there was which the strictest theory of Sabbath observance forbade, and which might have been violated on this occasion. The prohibition most to our purpose is one against performing a surgical operation on the Sabbath, unless there was imminent danger to life. We should not regard this doctrine as unreasonable; but there was nothing here that could be called a surgical operation. So I believe the true conclusion to be that though the Jewish rulers expected a violation of the Sabbath, none took place, and that our Lord was careful that none should. We know from other instances of our Lord's treatment of the sick that we are usually told no more than that *He laid his hands on them and healed them*. What the Jewish spectators on this occasion probably expected was that He would take the diseased limb in His hands, and stroke it until it was brought to healthy vigour; and such treatment could easily be described as a surgical operation. But our Lord took care that there should be no room for any such suspicion. He did not either call the diseased man to Him, or go over to him Himself. He makes him stand out in the midst, where all could see that there was no contact between them. He merely bids the sufferer to stretch forth his hand, and he finds himself able to obey. The sick man has been cured by a word, and our Lord's baffled enemies are left without a word to say.

According to St Mark's account those enemies did not speak the whole time. At first they waited in silence, to observe what Jesus would do, then when He had placed the man in the midst, it was He who

challenged them with the question, *Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to kill?* to which question they did not venture to reply. Still less were they inclined to speak after the cure had been performed. St Luke, who in the main closely follows Mark, likewise makes the challenge proceed from our Lord. But St Matthew has a version of the story, according to which it was they who sought matter of accusation against our Lord, and began by asking Him whether it was lawful to heal on the Sabbath day. There are coincidences between Matthew and Luke, to be noticed presently, to which there is nothing corresponding in Mark, which leads us to the conclusion that Q had contained either this same story or another similar story of healing on the Sabbath. The story, as St Mark tells it, hangs so completely together that we cannot but accept it as the most exact relation of what took place on this occasion; and if what was told in Q was intended to describe the same occurrence, we must suppose that St Mark modified it, in the light of fuller information received from others who had been present.

In the relation of the story St Luke follows Mark so closely that I count it no less than a blunder when critics are tempted, by small stylistic changes, to imagine that St Luke derived these variations from a different authority. On the other hand, we cannot think it a chance coincidence that all three Synoptics, in describing the restoration of the withered hand, use the word ἀπεκατεστήθη. Nor is this argument to be pronounced worthless though it should equally prove that St Matthew was acquainted with St Mark's narrative, a conclusion to which the comparison of other passages also leads us.

However, when a phrase is common to all three Evangelists a double explanation can be given: either the other two Evangelists copied Mark, or St Matthew and St Mark may both have retained a phrase belonging to their common original; and in this case there is

evidence of such an original which must presently be considered. Yet there can be no doubt that it is on Mark that St Luke mainly depends. On the other hand, St Luke has in quite a different connexion the defence which St Matthew reports our Lord as making here, namely, by the question, whether if a sheep fell into a pit, its owner would not pull it out on the Sabbath day. This, with the substitution of *an ass or an ox* for *one sheep*, occurs in the account of the healing of a dropsical man on the Sabbath (Luke xiv. 5), and he has substantially the same argument (Luke xiii. 15), in his account of the healing of a woman so paralysed as to be unable to hold herself erect. I consider that the legitimate inference is that this argument is derived from Q, where it did not occur in connexion with the miracle now under consideration, which possibly may not have been separately recorded by Q at all. Here, however, we must note that while St Luke retains St Mark's word περιβλεψάμενος, he does not copy what St Mark adds, *with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart*. We cannot doubt that these words are a genuine part of the Gospel of St Mark, who is apt to relate in a tone of indignation and astonishment instances where the spectators of our Lord's miracles failed to perceive the evidence of His divine nature which His works afforded. Other cases will be noticed as we go along. But it may be asked, why St Luke, who has copied so much of the rest, did not copy this. It may, perhaps, be said that the anger of our Lord was a topic on which St Luke did not love to dwell; but perhaps no other explanation is needed than that St Luke, who is here using two sources, Mark and Q, found it necessary to compress the matter which he took from one of them.

St Mark goes on to say that the baffled Pharisees then proceeded to take counsel with the Herodians how they might destroy Jesus. It is quite in conformity with human nature that instead of being convinced by the miracle, they set themselves to destroy Him who had

confuted them. But why with the Herodians? It is only St Mark who mentions them here. St Matthew only speaks of the Pharisees as thus consulting, and St Luke appears to know no more; for he says that *they communed one with another what they might do to Jesus*. The *they* can only mean the same persons who had been just described as watching whether He would heal on the Sabbath, a subject on which it is not likely that the Herodians would have felt any deep interest. But we can implicitly believe St Mark's account that the result of the deliberation of the Pharisees, who desired to destroy Jesus, was that it was necessary to obtain the co-operation of the Herodians. It was Herod's country. At the time of this incident Herod had cast John into prison, if he had not already recently put him to death. It could not but be known that John had marked out Jesus as his successor; and if Herod had already felt jealous of the influence of John as a popular leader, it would not be difficult to excite in him a like jealousy of Jesus; and St Luke (xiii. 31) bears testimony how successful had been the attempt to nurse Herod's jealousy.

OUR LORD'S CHANGE OF HIS SCENE OF LABOUR

MARK iii. 7a.

Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν
αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν.

MATT. xii. 15a.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν
ἐκεῖθεν.

Immediately after telling of this conspiracy entered into against our Lord, St Mark goes on to say that He *withdrew with his disciples to the sea*. The impression certainly conveyed is that it was because of this conspiracy, and so St Matthew expressly says, who, in copying Mark, adds the word *γνοὺς*. How it was He

knew we are not told. It is true that the conspiracy is likely to have been a secret one; but Jesus was not without friends in both sections of the conspirators who could have given warning of a design to make Him prisoner if He remained where He was. He had friends even in the household of Herod. St Luke counts (viii. 3) the wife of Herod's steward among those who supplied Jesus with funds; and among the Pharisees too, there was a minority who did not wish that He should be destroyed; for St Luke also (xiii. 31) tells of a warning given Him by certain of the Pharisees that Herod meant to kill Him, and that for His safety He ought to depart. It is very commonly imagined that this warning was given with no friendly motives, and was a mere attempt to frighten Him away. But St Luke's words, *προσῆλθάν τινες Φαρισαῖοι*, describe the action, not of the Pharisees as a body, but of some few members of the sect, and, when read in connexion with what St Mark tells us of concerted action between the Pharisees and Herod's people, lead us rather to think that a friendly warning of a real danger had been given. We are not bound to suppose that St Luke's anecdote is to be referred to the occasion we are now considering; for it is no doubt possible that like circumstances may have recurred; but we are not prevented from referring St Luke's account to the same occasion by the fact that his arrangement would seem to place the occurrence at a later period of our Lord's ministry than that which St Mark has assigned to it.

When we are told that our Lord withdrew, we ask, What place did He leave? and, What place did He retire to? We are not expressly told where the events occurred related by St Mark in the preceding sections, but I think we are not wrong in answering Capernaum; yet we hear of Capernaum immediately after, and have no reason to suppose that our Lord left the district. In fact, the answer recorded by St Luke (xiii. 32), as having been made by Him, when warned of the designs

of Herod, is quite suitable to the present occasion. He intimated that He was not alarmed by a threat of danger from Herod, because He knew that it was not in Galilee, but at Jerusalem, that His earthly career was to be brought to a close. He did, however, take some precaution, and, as St Mark says, *withdrew with his disciples to the sea*. Capernaum was close to the lake, but at some little distance from it, so that it was necessary for one wishing to go down to the lake to go out of the city. What I understand He did now was to go along the lake towards the upper end, where the Jordan entered it. Every move in that direction was taking Him out of the territory of Herod into that of Philip. But it was not from Herod himself that danger was at first to be apprehended; for it would seem (Mark vi. 14) that it was at a somewhat later period that the fame of Jesus reached Herod, and that he was made to apprehend danger from the Baptist's successor. The danger to our Lord was at first from Herod's people, rather than from Herod himself, and still more from the Pharisees, who had stirred the Herodians up, and who, while He lived among them, could tell how at any moment hands could be laid on Him without provoking a rescue. This was what made removal necessary; but it does not seem to have been immediate.

At the time of the healing of the palsied man, of which we read in Mark ii., our Lord seems to have been teaching in the large room of a house whose roof was uncovered in order to gain access to Him. And at the end of St Mark's third chapter we find Him still preaching in a room, His disciples sitting before Him, and His mother and brethren, when desiring to speak with Him, obliged to stand without. It seems to have been only when our Lord became an open-air preacher that the crowds became so great that the pressure caused inconvenience.

THE CROWDS

MARK iii. 7b-12.

Καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἠκολούθησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα, πλῆθος πολὺ, ἀκούοντες ὅσα ποιεῖ ἦλθαν πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτόν· πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐθεράπευσεν, ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας. καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκραζον λέγοντα, ὅτι, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν φανερὸν ποιήσωσιν.

MATT. iv. 24, 25.

Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν· καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις καὶ βασάνοις συνεχομένους, δαιμονιζομένους καὶ σεληνιαζομένους καὶ παραλυτικούς, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς. καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

MATT. xii. 15b, 16.

Καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας, καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν.

LUKE vi. 17-19.

Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος πολλὸς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τῆς παραλλοῦ Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, οἳ ἦλθαν ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ ἐνοχλοῦμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ἐθεραπεύοντο· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτουν ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο καὶ ἰάτο πάντας.

We read in the Acts that the effect of the persecution following on the death of Stephen was a great extension of the new religion, as its adherents were driven from Jerusalem to other cities. The same was the effect of the conspiracy which made Capernaum an unsafe place of residence for our Lord. As He was forced to become an open-air preacher the number of His auditors increased, and the fame of His wonderful power of healing brought people to seek His help for themselves, or for sick relatives.

St Matthew seems to have made a double use of this passage of Mark. The closest parallel to the present section is Matt. iv. 24, 25, where we can scarcely doubt that either St Matthew copied Mark, or that St Mark used the same authority as St Matthew. It seems to me that the second is the more probable hypothesis, as the differences between the two accounts appear to me more easily accounted for on the supposition that St Mark

varied from his original than that St Matthew did. The parallelism between the two Evangelists comes to an end with the Sermon on the Mount ; and we need no other explanation why there is nothing in Mark corresponding to that discourse than that it was not that Evangelist's plan to include in his Gospel long discourses, such as those of which St Matthew has preserved such valuable records. With St Matthew's twelfth chapter parallelism with Mark begins again. Matthew xii. 15, 16 is evidently to be referred to the same source as the present section of Mark, for it has the same place in both Gospels, namely, coming immediately after the relation of the conspiracy made against our Lord. St Mark, however (i. 25), had already told of our Lord's refusal to permit demons to give testimony to Him.

In Luke I find nothing to indicate that he used any other authority than Mark. He does indeed transpose this section and the next, which gives the names of the Apostles ; but it is a sufficient account of this that his object was to bring the narration of the assembling of a multitude, whom our Lord addressed in company with His disciples, into close connexion with the report of the Sermon in Luke vi. 20.

THE APPOINTMENT OF THE TWELVE

MARK iii. 13-15.

Καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἠθέλην αὐτός, καὶ ἀπήλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, ἵνα ᾤσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια· καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα.

MATT. x. 1.

Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

LUKE vi. 12, 13.

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐξελθεῖν αὐτόν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι, καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν,

I have preferred here rather to say *the Twelve* than *the Apostles*, because the appropriation of the latter

name to the Twelve, though undoubtedly early, was not the original usage. It is certain that our Lord in His lifetime had chosen twelve of His disciples for special favour, to whom He gave instructions other than those addressed to the bulk of His followers (Mark ix. 35; x. 32). At the Last Supper He is described (Matt. xxvi. 20), as sitting down *with the Twelve*. He promised them special honour in His Father's Kingdom, where they were to *sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel* (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30). After His death the Twelve were the governors of the Church. The phrase had become so established by use that St Paul employs it, 1 Cor. xv. 5, where it is not strictly applicable, viz., in speaking of our Lord's appearances after His resurrection to the Apostles, whose number had been reduced by the defection of Judas. It is intelligible then why the number of twelve was completed on the first vacancy, but not so when the rulers of the Church were known by a different title.

The name *apostle*, in the sense of *envoy* or *missionary*, seems to have been first given to the Twelve when our Lord sent them out in pairs to preach in neighbouring towns; and to have been given in reference to that special mission. But we find both from St Matthew's Gospel and St Mark's that the appointment of the Twelve had been made before. In fact, St Matthew does not relate that appointment at all; and it seems not to have been formally related in the document Q which he used. The charge given by our Lord on sending out these missionaries must be referred to Q, as being used both by St Matthew and St Luke, though only in a very abridged form in Mark; but St Matthew assumes the Twelve to have been chosen already, for he begins, *And he called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them authority over unclean spirits, etc.* At the end of this discourse it is still only the word *disciples* that is used: *When Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed thence*; and all through the rest of the Gospel the word *apostles* is never used.

Twice afterwards (xx. 17; xxvi. 20), when he has to speak of that body, they are called, not *the apostles*, but *the twelve disciples*. And twice again (xxvi. 14, 47) when the defection of Judas is related, he is described, not as an apostle, but as *one of the twelve*. It being the case that St Matthew does not use the word *apostle* before or after the section now under consideration, it deserves the more notice that there should be a single use of it in this section, and that there it should come in parenthetically, without any explanation why the name should be employed. The Evangelist had told that our Lord gave His twelve *disciples* authority to cast out demons and power to heal diseases, and then comes a little section containing the names of the Twelve, beginning, *Now the names of the twelve apostles are these*. It must be observed that no mention has been made of the Twelve having been chosen in order that our Lord might *send* them out to preach; nor even is this mentioned at the end of the discourse which the Evangelist records; for the conclusion runs, *When Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples*, not, as we might expect, *they went out to preach, as they had been sent*, but *He departed thence to teach and preach in their cities* (Matt. xi. 1).

I conclude from the difference with regard to the use of the word ἀπόστολος between this section and the rest of St Matthew's Gospel that the two are not of equal date. Criticism seems to me to show clearly that the original document to which this Evangelist and St Luke were both indebted for this discourse of our Lord, did not contain the names of those to whom it was addressed. It is worth mention too, that whereas in arranging the matter common to the Synoptic Gospels, if we do not find all three agreeing in their order, we usually have two agreeing against the third, so that there is some trace of an original common arrangement, with regard to the names of the Apostles no two Evangelists insert them in exactly the same place. Thus I am led to believe that the section which gives the names of the

Apostles (Matt. x. 2-4), though not belonging to the earliest form of the Gospel history, was added when the First Gospel assumed its present form, probably when from having been an Aramaic it became a Greek Gospel. We shall presently see that the use of the title *Apostles* to denote the rulers of the Church at Jerusalem was of very early introduction; and we need not be surprised that it should be used in this section.

We turn now to Mark. I have already inferred that the authority Q, used by St Matthew, had not given the names of the Twelve, nor related their first selection and appointment, but had assumed their pre-eminence as already recognised. It had already been recognised by Q that the appointment of the Twelve came before the sending them out to preach; and we must feel that St Mark judged rightly that the constitution of their office was an important event in the history of the Church, which deserved to be distinctly related. It appears that the elevation of the Twelve to this higher office took place by successive steps. In the first place, we read that our Lord called some of those who had been His accustomed hearers to be His especial companions; and the calling of Andrew and Peter, James and John, and of Matthew, is formally related in the Synoptic Gospels. The call, then, recorded at the beginning of the history, was not one to mere discipleship; but those who were thus called were to give up all former employments which interfered with companionship with Jesus in His work. And it appears from St Mark's history of the events of the Sabbath which followed the call of the four disciples, that even then our Lord took His disciples with Him on His missionary tours.

St Matthew and St Mark agree in relating that it was the increase of the multitudes who thronged our Lord that made it necessary for Him to increase the number of His assistants. He had compassion on the multitudes because they were *as sheep not having a shepherd*; and He directed His disciples to *pray the*

Lord of the harvest, that he send forth labourers into his harvest (Matt. ix. 36-38). And no doubt St Luke was right (vi. 12) in understanding what St Mark records (iii. 13) of Jesus going up into the mountain before His choice of the Twelve, as indicating prayer offered by Himself before taking this new step. St Mark does not mention that it was for the purpose of prayer that our Lord retired from the company of His disciples; but he tells of this temporary solitude of His, so as to bring out more strongly the action of our Lord's individual will in the choice of the rulers of His Church. He did not take those who happened to be in His company; He was apart from that company when He summoned to Him those *whom he himself would* (οὓς ἤθελεν αὐτός), *and they went away to him* (καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν). Thus it would seem that it was not only the Apostles first chosen who had received each a separate individual call, but that also when He completed into twelve the number of these more intimate disciples, each of the new members received in like manner a separate call.

St Mark separates by an interval (iii. 13; vi. 7) his account of two things which St Matthew has placed together, namely, the first choice of the Twelve, and the sending them forth in pairs to preach. We can have no hesitation in recognising the historical fitness of St Mark's arrangement, in which he has been followed by St Luke (vi. 13; ix. 1).

When we read St Mark's account in connexion with the supplemental information given by St Matthew and St Luke, we are at no loss to understand what took place, viz., that after nightfall had relieved our Lord from the pressure of the crowds which thronged Him by day, He ascended *the mountain* for the purpose of prayer, possibly accompanied by two or three of His more intimate disciples; and that, in the morning, He summoned to Him the other disciples whom He was about to charge with this new commission.

St Mark's words, according to the most widely

circulated version, are (iii. 14), καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστελλῇ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν, καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια. The first thing that calls for remark here is the use of the word ἐποίησεν, when we should rather have expected such a word as St Luke's ἐκλεξάμενος. The simplest explanation of St Mark's form of expression is that it arises from his objection to use the chronologically inappropriate title *apostles*. There is no awkwardness in using ποιεῖν for appointment to an office, if it be done with a double accusative. Thus no one would stumble at such a statement as, *He made Peter an apostle*, any more than we find difficulty in the statement (Acts ii. 36), *God made Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ*. And if the word *apostle* had at first borne the signification that was afterwards given it, the word *make* would have caused us no embarrassment; for the text in Mark might have run, *Jesus made twelve of his disciples apostles*. But at the period of time which St Mark is describing, even the Twelve themselves had not got that name. Mark is here telling of the first choice of the Twelve; and it was only at that later period, when their Master *sent them forth* to preach, that they earned the title of His *envoys*. Thus instead of describing the office to which they were appointed by a title, it became necessary to use a periphrasis, ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστελλῇ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν.

St Mark's phraseology, however, has a parallel in the Septuagint translation of 1 Sam. xii. 6, *It is the Lord that appointed Moses and Aaron, and that brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt*. See Heb. iii. 2.

Here we have to deal with a very notable various reading. In the parallel passage in which St Luke relates the selection of the Twelve (vi. 13), when he has told that out of His disciples our Lord chose twelve, he adds *whom also he named apostles*. That these words belong to the genuine text of Luke there can be no dispute; they appear also in the text of St Mark's account (iii. 14), according to B^s and their usual followers.

If I am right in thinking that St Luke, in writing his Gospel, made much use of St Mark's, then we must attribute agreement between these two Gospels, not to blunders of copyists, but to the fact that the common words had their place already in the copy of Mark which St Luke used.

What weighs much with me is that the presence of the clause is quite natural in Luke, but not so in Mark. When St Mark has told how our Lord gave Simon the surname of Peter, he at once drops the use of the former name, by which he has uniformly called him before, and thenceforward calls him nothing but Peter. Here the statement that our Lord called the Twelve *His apostles* leads to nothing: St Mark never uses the word again save when it can be translated *missionaries*. Yet it was not long before the fact that these Twelve had been ἀπόστολοι, not of Jewish communities or of Christian churches (titles which others could bear), but of Christ Himself, gave them their chief claim to consideration; and already when St Luke wrote, the name of *Apostles* for the rulers of the Church at Jerusalem had been fully established. In St Luke's Gospel these rulers are sometimes called *the Twelve*, sometimes *the Apostles*, but almost always when the former title is used we can believe that the Evangelist is using previous sources. In the book of the Acts they are called *Apostles* almost all through, and the word *Apostle* seems to have quite lost its original meaning of *missionary*; for if we gave the word that meaning the statement in the beginning of Acts viii. would sound oddly, that the effect of the persecution that arose on the death of Stephen was that the members of the Church of Jerusalem were scattered everywhere preaching the word, *except the missionaries*.

In the case before us, we can say with tolerable certainty that the manuscripts which omit the clause preserve an older reading than those which exhibit it. For there is no conceivable reason why any transcriber who found the clause in his archetype should omit it;

while, on the other hand, it is quite intelligible that one who wrote after *Apostles* had become the recognised designation of the rulers of the infant Church, should wish to note that this title had been given them by their Master when He sent them as His missionaries. We are only speaking of the comparative age of the two families of MSS., and are not concerned to deny that the introduction of the clause was very ancient, since it is found in Luke, whose Gospel is certainly earlier than the earliest date we can assign for the origin of the MS. which was the parent of B^s. When I say that the shorter form is the older, I am not concerned to define how much older, nor need I dispute with any one who may choose to defend the longer form, as enlarged by the Evangelist himself in a second edition. I think, if we set the two forms side by side, we must prefer the simpler as the original, and the other as a manipulation by, it may be, *viva voce* additions.

Καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα ἵνα ᾧσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν [θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους καὶ] ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια.

Καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα [οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν] ἵνα ᾧσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια [καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα].

In both cases I take the simpler forms to be the original, it being far easier to account for insertion than for omission. The Vulgate text corrects what seems a manifest omission by the Evangelist, who had said nothing about curing diseases, which was a work of our Lord's own (Matt. iv. 23; Mark iii. 10), and was included in the commission which He gave to His envoys (Matt. x. 8; Luke ix. 2, 6). Without enquiring why St Mark should have omitted mention of it in this place, I think the silence of our oldest witness sufficient evidence that he did, but the omission was one which a subsequent editor would be strongly tempted to supply. In like manner there was a strong temptation to insert the clause, *Whom also he named apostles*, if it were only to justify St Mark's own use of the word at the conclusion (Mark vi. 30); though there I consider that it should

be translated, *And the envoys gather together unto Jesus ; and reported to him what they had done, and what they had taught.* But when the periphrasis had been enlarged by the addition of this clause, it seemed necessary to catch up the thread of the narrative by the repetition of the words *καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα*, which now becomes *τοὺς δώδεκα*, the Twelve having been already mentioned.

THE NAMES OF THE APOSTLES

MARK iii. 16-19a.

(Καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι) Πέτρον, καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου (καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν Τίσι Βροντῆς), καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναῖον καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.

MATT. x. 2-4.

Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστὶν ταῦτα· πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, Φίλιππος καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος, Θωμᾶς καὶ Μαθθαῖος ὁ τελώνης, Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖος, Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν.

LUKE vi. 14-16.

Σίμωνα ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν [καὶ] Ἰάκωβον Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης.

I may notice in passing a slight awkwardness of expression in the terms in which St Mark introduces his list, for which the Evangelist himself rather than his transcribers seems to be responsible. It is such that a strict grammarian might maintain that Peter was not included in St Mark's list of Apostles ; for the accusative Πέτρον is made to do double duty. We want it to complete the sentence ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον ; and if we so employ it, it is absent from its place in the Apostolic list, Πέτρον, καὶ Ἰάκωβον, κ.τ.λ.

So trifling a matter scarcely needs mention ; but it is more important to remark that we have in the Synoptic Gospels three lists of the Apostles ; and though the

lists agree so closely that there is strong probability that they have all a common source—there is in fact agreement as to eleven of the names—yet St Luke mentions one, 'Ιούδας Ἰακώβου (*Judas the son*, or it may be *the brother of James*), whose name is not recorded by St Matthew or St Mark.

In the ordinary course of things, where no counter-acting supernatural interference takes place, uncertainty creeps into the early history of any great institution. Newly enlisted workers who throw themselves heartily into the performance of the task assigned to them often have little curiosity to enquire into the antiquity of the details of the system which they find in actual operation. Every living organism is constantly receiving developments; and in my own experience I have found that several details of practical working, the origin of which I myself remember, are accepted by the younger generation as of immemorial antiquity. I have often regretted that when I was myself a young man I had not the curiosity to enquire into the history of some of our existing usages, concerning which there were many then alive who could have informed me, but whose testimony is now lost. I suppose that if any one were now writing the history of one of our universities, and had to give a list of those who held the chief offices forty years ago, unless he had something more than unwritten tradition to guide him, he would be likely to omit the names of several who did good work in their time, but whose personality had not been such as to impress itself strongly on their contemporaries, and he would perhaps include the names of two or three of the immediately following generation whose activity had made their names remembered.

Now the rulers of the Church when St Luke wrote were not the same as those who received the original commission. We know for certain of one change—the substitution of Matthias for Judas Iscariot; and in the course of forty years there were probably other

changes. When St Luke wrote, the first place among the church rulers at Jerusalem belonged to James, *the Lord's brother*; but the best critics are agreed that he could not have been one of the original Twelve, for both St Mark and St John give us to understand that at the time of the appointment of the Twelve our Lord's brethren did not believe on Him. Nay, very respectable tradition asserts that it was only after our Lord's resurrection that an appearance to James brought him to full and complete faith. Yet we know from 1 Cor. ix. 5 that in the early days of the Church our Lord's brethren took an active part in preaching His Gospel. Other changes must have occurred during the interval between the appointment of the Twelve and the first publication of the Gospels, so that if the Evangelists had been dependent on their own enquiries for a list of the original Twelve, there would be likely to have been much variation between their accounts. The fact, however, is that they agree as to all the names but one. This agreement makes it reasonable to believe that all used a common document, while the one disagreement shews that they did not use it slavishly, but supplemented it with independent information.

Let us compare now St Matthew's list with St Mark's. We shall find in other cases indications that St Matthew used St Mark's Gospel, though in possession of an earlier source of information. And as I have noted an indication that St Mark's list of the Apostles was added as an afterthought to what he had derived from his principal earlier source, it is natural to conclude that the list of the Apostles was borrowed by St Matthew from Mark. Yet, on examination, it seems to me more likely that both Evangelists were indebted to a common authority. We are at once struck by the difference, that in St Matthew's list the Apostles are arranged in couples, but not so in Mark. We are told that our Lord sent out these missionaries two by two. St Luke tells the same of the Seventy (x. 1); and in the Clementines Peter is represented as sending out his

disciples in pairs in like manner. In the Acts too, when Paul and Barnabas can no longer travel together on a missionary tour, each seeks a new assistant, as if a preacher without a companion were impossible; and thenceforward we read of Paul and Silas, while Barnabas joins Mark with himself. Thus it is natural enough that the earliest list should exhibit a trace of this pairing. If this had been so in the list which St Mark had received, we can still see reason why this Evangelist might use a different arrangement; for he begins by telling how our Lord gave Simon the surname of Peter; and then it is appropriate to add that He gave the sons of Zebedee the name Boanerges. Thus Andrew comes to be separated from Peter, and the arrangement in pairs is abandoned.

Both lists begin with Peter, but St Matthew expressly says *πρῶτος Σίμων*. There is no room for doubt that in our Lord's lifetime Peter took the leading part among the Twelve; and, contrary to what we might have been led to expect by the tradition that Mark had been Peter's interpreter, we find in the First Gospel anecdotes honourable to Peter, which St Mark does not record. St Mark's arrangement of the names gives prominence to the fact that besides Peter there were two other disciples, James and John, whom our Lord had distinguished with special favour. On the whole then I am inclined to believe that the list of the Apostles which Matthew gives preserves the more ancient tradition, and that the arrangement in Mark which exhibits a triplicity of leading Apostles is that Evangelist's own. It does not seem likely that if the list which reached St Matthew had been a mere catalogue of separate names he would have undertaken to give the original couplings, unless he had some early tradition to guide him.

I come now to the only name about which the tradition is indistinct. It appears in the latest form that the Apostolic list assumed as *Lebbæus*, whose surname was *Thaddæus* (Matt. x. 3, Text. Rec.). This form,

however, we may disregard, as an attempt to reconcile two earlier conflicting accounts, one of which gave the name as Thaddæus and the other as Lebbæus. Of the MSS. which have reached us, the two oldest give the name as Thaddæus. But the authority for the form *Lebbæus* is also very ancient. It was accepted by Origen as the true reading of Matthew, and we may assume was so read by him in his MSS. of the Gospel (*Pref. Comm. in Ep. ad Romanos*). Consequently, the decision made by Tischendorf was that *Lebbæus* was the true reading of Matthew, and *Thaddæus* that of Mark. There is no doubt that in both Gospels the reading *Lebbæus* had very early and wide circulation in the class of MSS. commonly now classified as Western. But I find little reason for making much distinction between the evidence in the case of Matthew and of Mark. All that the testimony of Origen gives us a right to believe is that the reading *Lebbæus* was found in copies of St Matthew's Gospel before the end of the second century. But if we were to make any distinction between the two Gospels it is rather in Mark than in Matthew that we should expect to find the reading *Lebbæus*; for I can find no account of the origin of the variation so plausible as the suggestion that it arose out of an attempt to include in the list of the Apostles the Levi whom St Mark alone records as having received a summons from our Lord to follow Him identical with that addressed to Peter and Andrew, James and John.

The Hebrew name Levi was Græcised into the form *Λεββῆς* by Heracleon, who is chiefly known to us by large extracts from his comments on St John's Gospel preserved by Origen, and who therefore may be referred to the second century, the only room for controversy being how much earlier than Origen he lived. I suspect that the form *Λεββαῖος* retains the termination of *Θαδδαῖος*, when some ingenious editor thought of altering the first four letters. It is quite possible that the alteration was made simultaneously in both Gospels, and therefore I do not feel myself entitled to build any-

thing on the preference which has been given to the testimony for the reading $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ in St Matthew's Gospel. One thing I think we may conclude, viz., that at the time the name Lebbæus was introduced into the list the memory of the real Thaddæus must have been lost, and he had probably been some time dead.

There is, however, a Thaddæus of whom Eusebius, in the first book of his Ecclesiastical history, c. 13, gives an account, said to have been derived from the archives of the church of Edessa, who was said to have first planted the Gospel in that part of Mesopotamia. His name appears in extant Syriac documents as Addai; and possibly it was Eusebius who first gave it the form Thaddæus; but in any case this Thaddæus has no claim to a place in the Apostolic list; for the Syrian tradition only counts him as one of the Seventy. It was a different Apostle who was venerated for his share in the foundation of the early Syrian Church, namely Thomas, whose proper name is said to have been Judas; for, as the readers of the Fourth Gospel know, the word *Thomas* signifies no more than *twin*. Thus we are not given any clue to the appearance of the name Thaddæus in the lists of Matthew and Mark. Thomas, in the earlier lists, is not coupled with any Apostle but Matthew, and the Judas in St Luke's list stands by himself.

It is certainly a curious coincidence that when we find a Thaddæus in St Mark's list of the Apostles, replaced by a Judas in St Luke's, the legend should bring the names of Thaddæus and Judas into connexion with each other. We may safely conclude that when St Luke made his list of the Apostles one whom he designates as Ἰούδας ἰακώβου was either then bearing rule in the Church at Jerusalem, or had done so within existing memory, and had made such an impression as to have been counted as one who must have been among the original Twelve. It may also be inferred that usage had then ceased to connect the name Thaddæus with one of these Twelve, though no doubt we need not deny

that the name might have been found among the second generation of Christians.

I may note in passing the curiously parenthetical way in which St Luke brings in his list of the Apostles, in the middle of a very long sentence, *He called his disciples, and having chosen twelve from them, whom also he named apostles, Simon whom he also called Peter, etc., and having come down with them, stood on a level spot.*

THE SEVENTY

I dare say there are some of my readers who would not violently disapprove of my opinion that there are one or two of the original Twelve about whose names we cannot be quite certain, and that the existence of such uncertainty is no disparagement to our Evangelic record. Yet I fear many of those same persons would be shocked at any doubt being cast on the complete accuracy of St Luke's account of the appointment of the Seventy.

Of course if we adopt the older view of inspiration, according to which everything that St Luke relates must have taken place exactly as he relates it, such an enquiry as to his sources as I have engaged in is idle, if not reprehensible ; and we cannot draw any difference between the certainty of the evidence for one of his statements and for another ; all are alike beyond doubt and question. But in statements resting on human evidence there is room for great diversity between the certainty with which we can accept one, and that with which we can hold another ; and I cannot but feel that we can be very much more certain that our Lord chose twelve, whom He afterwards called Apostles, than that He afterwards chose other seventy also.

If every statement made by any one of the four Evangelists is absolutely beyond question, it is im-

material by how many of them any fact is attested ; but otherwise it makes an important difference that the choice of the Twelve is related by all, and that of the Seventy only by St Luke, that he gives no account of the occasion or circumstances under which the call was given, that he does not name any of those who received it, and that, when he has to record the charge given them, he does nothing but repeat the charge given on sending out the Twelve. In St Luke's later history it is not mentioned concerning any one that he had been one of the Seventy ; and when at a later period attempts were made to form a list of them, these lists inspire no confidence, being apparently formed by raking together all the names of early Christians which any tradition, however faint, had preserved, and then completing the number by invention.

And yet I do not doubt that our Lord from time to time commissioned other missionaries besides the Twelve to preach for Him. What seems to me less certain is that their number was exactly seventy, or that they were all sent at one time. St Luke's narrative gives me the impression that he had taken pains to complete previous accounts by personal enquiry : he is able to add the name of Judas to those given in former lists, and gives an explanation of the name *Kavavaïos* which we may well accept. I can easily believe that when he set himself to enquire the names of the original Twelve, he found some who had no pretensions to be included in that list, yet who could truly tell him that they had been commissioned by our Lord to preach for Him, and whose account of the charge they had received from Him did not essentially differ from the instruction given by our Lord to the Twelve, when He sent them out. Such persons probably were the Matthias and the Joseph Barsabas mentioned in the first chapter of the Acts ; and Philip, one of the Seven, to whom the title Apostle has been often given ; and there may well have been other such. It would be a natural explanation of the existence of these supplemental missionaries, that our

Lord had, after the example of Moses (Exod. xxiv. 1 ; Numbers xi. 16), appointed Seventy elders in a subordinate capacity to the Twelve. If St Luke accepted this solution too easily we should no longer be able to claim for him infallibility, but we need lose no faith in him as a diligent and faithful historian.

CHARGES MADE BY OUR LORD'S ENEMIES

MARK iii. 19b, 20, 21.

Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον· καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν [ὁ] ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν, ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη.

St Mark's Gospel gives us a more lively picture than do the other Gospels of the growing hostility of the ruling classes to our Lord, which reached its height at the epoch which now comes under consideration. We have read how the rage of the Pharisaic party against Him led them to seek the help of Herod's adherents, whence our Lord's life or liberty was so seriously threatened that He could no longer make Capernaum His headquarters. And now we are told that even His own relatives were carried away by the prevailing opinion that He was out of His mind, and ought to be put under restraint.

St Mark's narrative here has the aspect of having suffered a dislocation of order ; yet further consideration leads us to believe that we have here a proof of the fidelity with which St Mark reproduces the information given him, even as respects the order of narration. The difficulty is that after we have been told how our Lord was so endangered by the hostility which encountered Him in Capernaum that He was forced to retire towards the upper end of the lake, yet now we find Him again teaching in a house in Capernaum, probably the same as that in which He

had healed the paralytic man; for it is natural to connect the ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον of this section with ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν (ii. 1). He is still in the house when His mother and His brethren are unable to get admission to Him on account of the crowd; and it is not until the next chapter (iv.) that we have the formal narrative of what had been described in a general way before, of His teaching from a boat on the lake.

The explanation I take to be is that the difficulty arises from the fact that the chronological order of events was not the same as that of their logical sequence. It was necessary that the Evangelist should tell how the rage of the Pharisaic party was stirred up by their failure to find evidence that Jesus had broken the Mosaic Law, and that they then made plots with the Herodians against His life. But it is natural to believe that some interval took place between the making of these plots, and the danger to our Lord becoming so known to His disciples as to induce them to provide that a boat should wait on Him. Much, then, of what is related in the earlier part of the chapter seems to have been told by way of anticipation, and the events related in the latter part of chapter iii. to have preceded our Lord's change of headquarters.

To the Christian reader it is shocking that any one should be able to suppose that our Lord was out of His mind; yet if we consider the circumstances, we perceive that the idea was one most likely to occur, as it often has done since, when followers of His, who were afterwards venerated as saints, had judgments passed on them by sensible men of the world. It is in itself perfectly credible that our Lord should have made the impression commonly produced by one who steps completely out of the beaten track. Here was a young man who, instead of working at his trade in the ordinary way, went about preaching without authority, giving himself up to such work

so completely, that he scarcely left himself time to take food, always surrounded by a mob of enthusiastic followers, some of whom may possibly have conducted themselves in such a way as to give no favourable idea of the sanity of their leader. Should we be surprised if in such a case the verdict of the upper classes was, This seems to be a pious, well-meaning man, but evidently somewhat touched in his head. His friends ought not to permit him to go about as he does; they ought to put some check on his doings? We must not think harshly of our Lord's brethren if they could not help being affected by an opinion which was becoming current, and was doubtless expressed to them by different persons in reproaches for their remissness. It is not astonishing if it is only through St Mark's Gospel we hear that our Lord's family were seriously affected by an opinion as repugnant to the feelings of His disciples when St Matthew or St Luke wrote, as it is to our own. But St John, who, we have reason to believe, was acquainted with the Second Gospel, confirms St Mark's representation by his statements (vii. 5) that the brethren of Jesus did not believe on Him, and (x. 20) that there were those who said that He was mad, or, as the more hostile expressed it, that He had a devil (see also John vii. 20; viii. 48, 52).

It may be doubted concerning these two forms of expression, whether that which in our ears is the more offensive really meant much more than the other, in the ears of the people of that day. Controversies concerning the reality of demoniac possession lie in a region outside the province of him whose business is to register physical phenomena; for these phenomena may be the same, whether the cause of the bodily disturbance comes from within or from without; and it is very possible that diseases which a modern observer would describe as cases of mania or epilepsy would be regarded by a Jew of our Lord's time as indicating possession by a demon. In like manner, the assist-

ance of a demon was suspected if any one exhibited unusual energy and activity. We have no right to pronounce such an hypothesis as in itself foolish or absurd; for it is an attempt to explain phenomena for which a philosopher of the present day can give no more satisfactory account.

The process of suggestion of thoughts goes on independently of our wills. Brilliant ideas occur to one man which will not suggest themselves to another, however much he may desire it. And when they come, they often flash on the mind unexpectedly and unaccountably. We may say that the difference in this respect between one man and another results from some difference in the constitution of their brains; but why there should be any connexion between thoughts and motions of the brain is a mystery. The harmonious duality between the material and the spiritual is, for the present, an ultimate fact. Granted that the most clear-sighted observer of a philosopher engaged in the deepest speculations could discern no physical fact but certain minute vibrations of the particles of his body, or perhaps a certain eddy in the ether, the hypothesis that he had a mind may be as gratuitous an assumption as that new thoughts are caused by the action of some invisible beings; and if they are, does it make much difference whether we call these beings microbes or demons?

THE CHARGE OF CASTING OUT DEVILS BY BEELZEBUB

MARK iii. 22-26.

MATT. xii. 22-28.

LUKE xi. 14-20.

MATT. ix. 32-34.

The Jewish theory of demoniac possession was turned to ingenious account by the scribes who came

down from Jerusalem, probably commissioned by the authorities there to report on the proceedings of the Galilean prophet. They saw their way to damage His reputation in the very point where He had gained the highest celebrity. What seems more than anything else to have caught the imagination of the populace was the calm courage with which He would approach raging maniacs (whom others dared not go near, until they had been secured by bonds), and by mere words of command obtain immediate obedience, and restore the sufferers to their right mind. The explanation these scribes offered was that Jesus owed His power to being Himself a demoniac, nay, a worse demoniac than the rest, being possessed by the king of all the demons. Thus the demons who bore witness that He was the Son of God must be regarded as His accomplices. It is evident that any one who accepted such a theory became inaccessible to any proof of our Lord's heavenly Sonship; for every evidence He gave of His divine power was only regarded as demonstration of the Satanic influence under which He acted. We can see at once the peculiar malignity of this blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as it tended to make recovery from it impossible. The same lesson is taught in Heb. vi. 4-6.

St Mark gives no explanation why the question, By what power our Lord cast out demons, should have been raised at this particular time. But both St Matthew (ix. 32-34; xii. 22-24) and St Luke (xi. 14, 15) connect the charge of casting out demons by Beelzebub with one particular miracle—namely, the casting of a demon out of a dumb man, whose dumbness, however, did not proceed from disease of the organs of speech, but from mental disturbance, so that when he was restored to his right mind, he was able to speak. This case, however, seems to have been of a kind which we shall have occasion to discuss more fully afterwards.

It is to be noted that it does not appear from any of the accounts that the suggestion of the influence of Beelzebub was made in our Lord's hearing; and when

we come to think of it, we see that it is more likely that this should be said *of* Him rather than *to* Him. We can safely ascribe to Q a point in which the reports of St Matthew and St Luke agree, viz., that it was not from anything said to Him by opponents, but from independent knowledge that our Lord was acquainted with the Pharisees' explanation of His power over demons: St Matthew says (xii. 25) εἰδὼς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν, St Luke (xi. 17) has εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα.

St Mark, who tells the story more fully than had been done in Q, would rather convey the impression that our Lord's disciples reported to Him what they had heard said. St Mark's impersonal ἔλεγον rather suggests that this, which soon became a commonplace with our Lord's opponents, had been repeated to the disciples by more than one person. But what is most interesting is our Lord's conduct when He knew of this malicious invention: He grappled with it at once; He sent for those who had circulated it, and pointed out its unreasonableness.

We may conclude that St Mark and Q are speaking of the same incident; for they both refer it to the same period of our Lord's ministry. In the course of St Mark's narrative it comes after our Lord's selection of the Twelve (iii. 16), and before His sending them out in pairs to work at a distance from Him (vi. 7). St Matthew also places it before this mission, for he represents our Lord as referring to this calumny in His charge to the Apostles when He was sending them out (x. 25): *If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household!*

It is important to remark that we have here the occurrence of what may be called the Q phenomenon, that is to say, agreement between St Matthew and St Luke in things which they could not have learnt from Mark. The agreement is not only in the substance of what is related, but extends to identity of verbal expression.

MATT. xii. 27, 28.

LUKE xi. 19, 20.

Καὶ εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοῦλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ
 ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν ; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ κριταὶ ἔσονται
 ὑμῶν. εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια,
 ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

These words are identical in the two Gospels, save that instead of ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ. Luke has ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ, itself an Old Testament phrase (Exod. viii. 19). The words that occur here are not so common that casual agreement is conceivable. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that not only did the Evangelists use a common source, but that if that source had been originally Aramaic, there must have been a current Greek translation of it. I think that in this case there is evidence both that St Mark here used Q, and also that the other two Evangelists were acquainted, not only with Q, but also with St Mark's account. And I believe that in order to fully understand the history we must combine all the accounts.

I see nothing to forbid our supposing that the disciples were allowed to exercise their authority over demons before they had been sent away ; and it is thus I understand His argument, *If I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out ?* The whole of the Pharisaic explanation turned on the supposition that the demon who possessed our Lord was superior in authority to the evil spirits who possessed others. But this was a prerogative which was not transferable. If He was possessed by Beelzebub, by whom were His Apostles and the ordinary Jewish exorcists possessed ?

But we must not omit to mention that we have here a duplicate in Matthew, the story which is fully told (xii. 22, etc.) having been briefly mentioned (ix. 32). There are cases where I am disposed to believe that St Matthew has added an account derived from Mark to a less full relation of the same incident which had been given in Q. In the present case I account for the duplicate by regarding the short section in chapter ix. as an after-thought of the Evangelist, added in order to give an explanation of the saying *If they have called*

the master of the house Beelzebub; for it would evidently be a fault in composition, if one who read this saying in the tenth chapter got no explanation of it until the twelfth.

It must be mentioned here that Hort was much disposed to reject as what he calls "a Western non-interpolation" the last verse (34) in that short section of Matt. ix., οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον, Ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. The evidence for rejection is extremely slender, being merely that it is not found in three Western MSS., while all the best authorities are opposed to the omission. I must own that the verse bears very much the appearance of an insertion suggested by Mark. The words *By the prince of the demons he casteth out demons* are Mark's words, and ἔλεγον also is Marcan. St Matthew (xii. 24) and St Luke (xi. 15) introduce the same accusation with εἶπον or εἶπαι. On the other hand, admitting that there was a use of Mark, the question remains whether this use was made by St Matthew himself or by his copyists. But having convinced myself on other grounds that St Matthew did know St Mark's Gospel, I must admit the former solution to be possible, and I consider that the disputed verse shows clear traces of St Matthew's hand. It states that the suggestion that our Lord gained His power from Beelzebub was made *by the Pharisees*. So St Matthew has it (xii. 24); but the Pharisees are not named in this connexion either by St Mark or St Luke. It may seem paradoxical, but it is the Marcan character of Matt. ix. 34, which makes me think that verse more likely to come from St Matthew himself than from his copyists. A scribe who knew no Gospel but St Matthew's might be tempted to add to the story briefly told in chapter ix. a trait which he found in the fuller narrative of chapter xii.; but in that chapter he could not find Mark's phrases. St Mark does not use the word *Beelzebub* which occurs twice in the two verses common to Matthew and Luke (Matt. xii. 27, 28; Luke xi. 19, 20), but absent from Mark. But both St Matthew and

St Luke agree with St Mark in using the word *Satan* in our Lord's reply, *If Satan cast out Satan*.

After these verses follows in all the Gospels

MARK iii. 27.

Ἄλλ' οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον τὸν ἰσχυρὸν δῇσῃ, καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει.

MATT. xii. 29.

Ἡ πῶς δύναται τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἀρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον δῇσῃ τὸν ἰσχυρὸν; καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει.

LUKE xi. 21, 22.

"Ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος φυλάσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ αὐτόν, τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἶρει ἐφ' ἣ ἐπεπολθεὶ καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν.

The connexion here is obvious enough: "You are not to adopt the absurd conclusion that my casting out devils is a sign that Satan's kingdom is divided in itself, you ought rather to perceive that it means that a stronger than Satan has come upon him and is spoiling his goods." We are reminded of our Lord's temptation, when He refused to accept anything from Satan except on the terms of conquest.

After this verse St Matthew (xii. 30) and St Luke (xi. 23) have another not found in Mark, *ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει*. This is part of the evidence that St Mark is here abridging Q. Next follow in Matthew and Mark the saying about the peculiar malignity of the sin against the Holy Ghost.

MARK iii. 28-30.

Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν· ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος. ὅτι ἔλεγον, Πνεῦμα ἁκάθαρτον ἔχει.

MATT. xii. 31, 32.

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

LUKE xii. 10.

Καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

But it has to be remarked that St Luke separates this saying from the context in which St Matthew and St Mark have given it, and places it together

with another saying of our Lord's, its connexion with which is obvious. The best explanation is that this verse had been given as an isolated saying in Q, and had been placed in its true connexion by St Mark, which would account for his adding, *Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit*. We could thus understand St Matthew's adopting St Mark's arrangement; but it is less easy to see why St Luke should not have done so also, supposing he had read this verse of Mark.

There is no doubt that St Luke, in the composition of his Gospel, not only employed the source Q, but included also a good deal of what may be called the Petrine tradition. The questions remain for discussion, Was it through St Mark's Gospel that St Luke knew the Petrine tradition, or had it been preserved in an independent form used alike by St Mark and St Luke? And again, supposing that St Luke knew St Mark's Gospel, did he know it in the form of a written book, or only through oral recitations, which may have been fragmentary and interrupted? If St Luke's close adherence to St Mark's order in the earlier part of his Gospel inclines us to believe that St Luke read our Second Gospel, this notable deviation from St Mark's order must be remarked as a fact counting on the other side. Yet it is not one which demonstrates ignorance of Mark; for when a writer is using two sources, we cannot always pretend to explain the reason for the deviation, if he sometimes follows the order of one, sometimes that of the other. St Luke is here using Q, and he might not have had at the moment in his mind St Mark's note of the occasion on which our Lord's words had been used; a note, however, for which we must be thankful, since it better enables us to understand to what kind of offences our Lord's words apply. In this case I myself am disposed to explain the difference of order between the two Evangelists by the difference of the objects which each had mainly in view: St Mark's appears to have been chiefly historical. It seems to me that St Luke desired to give our Lord's

words a wider application than to the blasphemies uttered in His lifetime, and to extend them to those directed after His death against the Holy Ghost (see p. 298), and not merely to what we now regard as the ordinary manifestations of His influence, but even to those which we count extraordinary or miraculous.

After the verses about the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, St Matthew adds five verses (xii. 33-37), not found in this connexion in Mark or Luke. One of these verses is found in St Matthew's report of the Sermon on the Mount, and three of them in the report in Luke vi., of the same or a kindred discourse. The question is whether these five verses were found in this place in Q, or whether St Matthew has chosen to insert here words only known to him as having been at some time spoken by our Lord. Now I lay no stress on the omission of the verses either by St Mark, who habitually abridges Q, or by St Luke, who is evidently abridging in this place, for he compresses into one discourse our Lord's answer to the suggestion of demoniac influence, and His reply when asked to exhibit a sign from heaven.

There is nothing that forbids us to believe that our Lord on two different occasions used the saying that an evil fruit comes from an evil tree; and in both the places where they are reported, the words fall in completely with the context. When our Lord bids His disciples to *beware of false prophets*, He might be expected to give some rule for distinguishing the false from the true, and accordingly He gives the rule *By their fruits ye shall know them*. In the present case, the section is equally in its place. What Jesus had said about the deadly effect of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost suggests the enquiry, Can the speaking of any words have consequences so fatal? So He then points out that the evil words are not the disease, but the symptom. Evil words are but the indication and the expression of evil thoughts. There is no injustice then in judging a man by his words. In the place in which St Luke gives the same saying (Luke vi. 43-45) the connexion

with what precedes is by no means so clear; and it is more easy to believe that the Third Evangelist has here joined together sayings which he found without any record of the occasion on which each was spoken.

OUR LORD'S MOTHER AND HIS BRETHREN

We have here a difference of arrangement between Matthew and Mark. St Matthew here has two sections which need separate comment, viz., the demand of a sign from heaven, and the section about the relapsed demoniac, which are also used by St Luke in such a way as to give us reason to think that they stood in this order in Q. St Mark has something corresponding to the first section in a later place. The second he omits altogether, and now passes at once to the section, also found in Q, concerning our Lord's repulse of an interview sought by His mother and His brethren. I here follow St Mark's order, because I consider that that Evangelist designedly placed it in close connexion with his history of the attempts of the ruling party at Capernaum to silence the new teacher.

MARK iii. 31-35.

Καὶ ἔρχονται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν. καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει, Τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει, Ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. ὃς ἂν ποιῇ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

MATT. xii. 46-50.

Ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἰσθήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ, Τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα [αὐτοῦ] ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν, Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου· ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιῇ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφός καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

LUKE viii. 19-21.

Παρεγένετο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. ἀπηγγέλη δὲ αὐτῷ, Ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐστήκασιν ἔξω ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦς, Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.

On comparing these accounts we are struck by the comparative brevity of St Luke's version. We could draw no inference from it as to the circumstances of time or place in which this incident occurred. St Matthew and St Mark give substantially the same impression as to the period of our Lord's life to which it is to be referred. St Luke gives it an earlier place than he does to other sayings which St Matthew and St Mark refer to the same occasion. St Luke's authority would seem then to have told the story as an isolated anecdote; St Matthew and St Mark, as I have said, are in sufficient agreement as to the time, but St Mark gives a different impression as to the place. St Matthew has related it in connexion with an account of the healing of a demoniac, and with the reply made by our Lord to the cavils of those who attributed His power to an evil source.

We should imagine, from both Matthew and Luke, the scene to be a street, or some other public place, and that the crowd which impeded the approach of the mother and brethren of Jesus consisted of persons who had witnessed the miracle, or who had drawn near to hear the discussion to which it gave rise. But it is plain from Mark that the incident we are now considering took place in a house. Our Lord's mother and His brethren are not, as we might have imagined, standing on the outside of a crowd of listeners, and vainly endeavouring to come closer in order better to receive His instructions. In that case we may well believe that room would have been made for them. But they are standing *outside*, and instead of asking for admission, they send in a message desiring Him to come *out* to them. The word ἐξῆλθε is also attested by Matthew and Luke. It is not that some one comes in to tell that our Lord's relatives are outside; but they send in a message which is passed up by one to another of His hearers.

We must further observe that the house in which our Lord taught was not that inhabited by His brethren.

St Mark tells (iii. 21) that when His relatives *heard* that He was so beset by His auditors that He had scarcely time to take food, they *went out to lay hold on Him*. We need not suppose that their intention was unfriendly ; it would have been most natural that they should wish Him, even for His own health's sake, to discontinue His unusual labours, and return to the habits of ordinary life. We are not to understand Mark iii. 21 as stating that it was our Lord's relatives who said *He is beside himself* ; for the impersonal ἐλεγον may often be translated by the passive, *It was said*. But it was not only said, but believed by a great many, and in all probability His relatives were censured for their remissness in not putting Him under some kind of restraint. Surely it would indicate no want of affection in a mother, if, influenced by the opinion of those about her, and painfully solicitous for her Son's health, she sought an opportunity for maternal expostulation with Him.

Reading St Mark's account as a whole, we find no reason to think that our Lord's answer proceeded either from coolness of affection, or, as some would have it, from an intention to discourage by anticipation excessive worship of His mother. When we observe that our Lord's relatives, instead of wishing to *come in* and profit by His teaching, wanted Him to discontinue His teaching and *come out* to them, we see at once that if He was to continue His work it was necessary for Him to assert His freedom from the restraints of earthly relationships.

Though St Luke, as I have said, does not, in this place, relate this disowning by our Lord of the authority of His kinsmen after the flesh—a little history which he had already given an earlier place in his narrative—yet he shows himself not unacquainted with St Mark's arrangement. For I believe that it was because St Mark had placed this story here that St Luke has placed here [*i.e.*, after the charge of casting out devils by Beelzebub] a kindred story of our Lord's reply to the woman who cried, *Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck* (Luke xi. 27, 28.)

THE DEMAND OF A SIGN FROM HEAVEN

I return now to the two sections omitted by St Mark, but which I believe to have stood in Q before the section we last considered.

MATT. xii. 38.

Τότε ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων λέγοντες, Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν.

MATT. xii. 39, 40.

Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχὰλις σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωάννου τοῦ προφήτου. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας.

LUKE xi. 16.

Ἄλλοι δὲ πειράζοντες σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐζήτουν παρ' αὐτοῦ.

LUKE xi. 29, 30.

Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροισομένων ἤρξατο λέγειν, Ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρὰ ἐστίν· σημεῖον ζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωάννου. καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο [ὁ] Ἰωάννης τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ.

St Mark has nothing corresponding in this place ; but he represents the same demand as made to our Lord on a later occasion, and it is probably this which has led to a duplicate in St Matthew. See p. 344.

MARK viii. 11, 12.

Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν αὐτῷ ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει, Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον ; ἀμὴν λέγω, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον.

MATT. xvi. 1, 4.

Καὶ προσελθόντες [οἱ] Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι πειράζοντες ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. . . . Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχὰλις σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωάννου. καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν.

I have arrived at the conclusion in other cases that St Matthew having in an early chapter reproduced an account as given by Q, has in a later chapter repeated the same thing in a place corresponding to that which it has in Mark. This has been my conclusion, for example, in instances already cited, viz., the saying about the plucking out the right eye, Matt. v. 29, repeated in xviii. 8, and the precept about divorce, v. 32, repeated in xix. 9. The present seems to be a

parallel case, where a saying which we attribute to Q, on account of the coincidence between Matthew and Luke, does not appear in the corresponding place in Mark, but is repeated in Matthew in a place answering to the later place in which St Mark inserts it; and there seems to be a trace of Marcan influence in the fact that on the first occasion, in Matthew, the Pharisees are represented as only asking for *a sign*, but on the second occasion Matthew and Mark agree in representing the demand as one for *a sign from heaven*. It must be admitted, however, that we have every reason to believe that the demand for a sign was made more than once; and that our Lord on different occasions made different answers, each of which we now consider.

First let us take the answer reported by Q, that no sign should be given to that wicked and adulterous generation but the sign of the prophet Jonah. St Matthew goes on, in verse 40, to give an explanation of this enigmatical saying; but the silence of St Luke would lead us to conclude that the common authority Q had not explained what the sign of Jonah was. St Luke's explanation (xi. 30) is that as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so should the Son of Man be to that generation. But, in what way was Jonah a sign to the Ninevites? and it does not appear to me that Q had given any other answer than, the Ninevites required no sign but the impression made by the prophet himself, which sufficed to effect their conversion.

I return now to the explanation of the sign of Jonah given by Matthew xii. 40, that as Jonah had been three days and three nights in the whale's belly so should the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. I have already expressed my belief that this explanation was not given in Q (the common authority of Matthew and Luke), for if it had been, I cannot think that St Luke would have omitted it; and I believe that we have in this verse the comment made on the saying about the sign of Jonah, when it was repeated in the public reading of the Palestinian

Church. No intimation is given in the Old Testament that the Ninevites had been made acquainted with the swallowing of Jonah by the fish; so that it does not appear that in respect of this occurrence he was a sign to the Ninevites. Further, if we are to regard what is said, not as an accommodation of a Scripture incident, but as a prophecy, the prophecy was not fulfilled. The Gospel history entitles us to say that our Lord rose from the dead *on the third day*, but no latitude ascribed to Jewish language would stretch the time of our Lord's sojourn in *the heart of the earth* to *three days and three nights*. Moreover the comments which both St Matthew and St Luke report on the different reception given to our Lord's preaching, and to Jonah's, which certainly came from Q, have no relevance to Matthew's explanation.

Yet I willingly believe that this explanation is founded on words really spoken by our Lord, though more probably in a different context. When His too sanguine disciples urged Him to go up to Jerusalem to proclaim His Kingdom, which they imagined would be immediately established, He made known to them that the result would be, not victory, but rejection and crucifixion. Yet He did not represent that this defeat was to be the end. He had on another occasion quoted the prophet Hosea (vi. 6); and there seems to me good reason for thinking that He had used to His disciples another verse of the same prophet (vi. 2), *After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him*. There seems to be a reminiscence of this verse in Luke xiii. 32, *I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected*; and He may have wished to bring the same verse to the mind of His disciples when He said, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up* (John ii. 19). It seems to me then very probable that our Lord may have referred to what had been told about Jonah's three days and three nights, in illustration of the principle that resurrection is possible after what

had seemed hopeless ruin ; and that Church tradition may have here been founded on a real saying of our Lord's, though possibly not uttered in answer to the demand of a sign from heaven.

St Mark gives us no help to interpret the saying about Jonah ; for he omits that saying altogether, and contents himself with reporting that our Lord had declared that no sign (*from heaven*) would be given to *that generation*. If we ask then, Did He mean that such a sign should never be granted? we must take into account His prediction (Matt. xxiv. 30) *Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven . . . and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory*. St Mark, xiii. 26, reports the same prediction in the abridged form, *Then shall they see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory*. In very early times the idea was entertained that the sign from heaven was to be the appearance of the Cross in the heavens, but all the Scripture indications point to no other sign than the coming in the clouds of the Son of Man Himself. Our Lord three times refers to this sign of His second coming, Matt. xvi. 27 ; xxv. 31 ; xxvi. 64.

I doubt not then that when St Mark reports our Lord as saying that no sign would be given to the wicked and adulterous generation in which He lived, it was with the reserved implication that that sign was still to be given at a future time.

The *wicked and adulterous generation* of Q seems to have suggested the *adulterous and sinful generation* of Mark viii. 38.

MATT. xii. 41, 42.

Ἄνδρες Νινευεῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωάν, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Ἰωάν ὤδε. βασιλίσσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Σολομῶνος ὤδε.

LUKE xi. 31, 32.

Βασιλίσσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Σολομῶνος ὤδε. ἄνδρες Νινευεῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωάν, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Ἰωάν ὤδε.

It is impossible to compare these two versions without acknowledging that they have a common original (in both we have *πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ* . . . *πλεῖον Σολομῶνος*; we should have expected *μειζόν*, as in Matt xii. 6), Luke even preserving the Aramaic cast of that original, exhibited in the double *καὶ ἰδοὺ*. We must note, however, the freedom with which St Luke used his authorities. He apparently did not think it worth while to correct what may have been an accidental slip, in inserting the verse about the Queen of the South, before he had completed his account of what our Lord had said about the men of Nineveh.

WEATHER SIGNS

I have said that the demand for a sign was made to our Lord more than once, and that He did not always give the same answer. On some occasions He seems to have given the answer that they had signs enough if only they gave them the same attention that they habitually gave to the ordinary indications of weather change. Accordingly in the Received Text of Matthew, in the second place where the Evangelist tells of the demand for a sign, we find this answer ascribed to our Lord.

MATT. xvi. 2, 3.

Ὁψίας γενομένης λέγετε, Ἐὐδία, πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός· καὶ πρῶτὶ Σήμερον χειμῶν, πυρράζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανός. τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, τὸ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε.

This passage had very early and very wide circulation, but it is not found in the oldest MSS. ; and when we consider the question, we find reason to think that it must be the shorter version which more truly represents the original. For if this passage had belonged to the original text of Matthew, it is not credible that that text would have been abridged by the omission of words in which there was nothing at which any one could stumble,

and which we have good reason for accepting as a genuine saying of our Lord's. Besides that we have the agreement here of two independent authorities, we recall our Lord's parable from the fig tree (Matt. xxiv. 32; Luke xxi. 29), in which also the conclusions which we may draw from the signs of the times are illustrated by the inferences we are in the habit of drawing from natural phenomena. St Luke has a parallel passage (xii. 54-57), not at all in verbal agreement with Matthew, but in complete agreement with the same general idea. This passage in Luke does not occur in any context resembling that of the passage in Matthew, but is given as an isolated saying of our Lord's. If we reject the passage as not part of the real text of Matthew, we strengthen the case that the First Evangelist made use of Mark. For with this omission the section in Matthew xvi. is a mere repetition of that in Matt. xii.; even containing again the phrase *γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς*. It would not be wonderful if a later editor saw the necessity of making some difference, by inserting the answer about weather signs. If we suppose that St Matthew used St Mark's Gospel, we can understand the Evangelist repeating the account of a demand for a sign in a place corresponding to that which it has in St Mark's Gospel, and with St Mark's addition, *a sign from heaven*; but as St Mark had not given any detailed account of the answer, there was nothing to add to what had been given already.

But if this little section about weather signs is not a genuine part of the First Gospel, whence did it come? Though the general bearing of the sayings in Matthew and Luke is the same, the wording is so different that the one could not have been copied from the other. The section in Luke (xii. 54-57) runs as follows:

Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις, "Ὅταν ἴδῃτε νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε ὅτι, "Ὁμβρος ἔρχεται, καὶ γίνεται οὕτως· καὶ ὅταν νότον πνέοντα, λέγετε ὅτι, Καύσων ἔσται, καὶ γίνεται. ὑποκριταὶ τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τούτου πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν; Τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον;

The *ἐλεγεν* here does not necessarily imply that these words were spoken on the same occasion as the saying recorded by St Luke immediately before. In this latter part of Luke xii. the Evangelist puts together several sayings which he seems to have known as isolated utterances of our Lord, placed in different contexts by other Evangelists. There is nothing improbable in the arrangement in Matt. xvi., which gives the words in reply to a demand for a sign from heaven. But on comparing the passages in Matt. xvi. and in Luke xii., we find not a particle of verbal resemblance; nay, the instances of weather change quoted in each case are quite different. It is evident that this various reading arises from editorial change, and not from a transcriber's error in inserting in one Gospel what properly belongs to another.

A change, however, which could not possibly be made, except deliberately, by a transcriber set to copy the written report of a speech, might easily be made in all good faith by one who had heard the words recited aloud, and endeavoured to report them from memory (see pp. 67, 123). In the present case the variations are not more than this hypothesis would easily account for. One who had heard the passage read as given by St Matthew might very clearly remember that a description had been given of the attention paid to tokens of change of weather, without having impressed on his memory the particular changes used in the illustration, which he would consequently be obliged to supply for himself when he repeated the saying.

THE RELAPSED DEMONIAK.

MATT. xii. 43-45.

LUKE xi. 24-26.

We must in the first place remark the almost complete verbal identity between St Matthew's account

and St Luke's; from which I conclude that both accounts came from a single authority, and that the tradition in this place had not been complicated by other independent reports of the same discourse. We may conclude also from this verbal agreement, through three verses containing many unusual words, that the common authority of St Matthew and St Luke was not oral, but written. In Luke this section immediately follows our Lord's answer to the charge that He cast out demons through the power of Beelzebub; and it was suitable, in the interests of orderly arrangement, to put together the two sections which treat of the casting out of demons. But in truth they have no such connexion with each other as would lead us to suppose that the two sayings of our Lord were suggested by the same incident, or spoken on the same occasion. I have stated already that Q appears to have related consecutively our Lord's answers, when accused of alliance with Beelzebub, and when challenged to exhibit a sign. St Matthew connects the section about the relapsed demoniac with the latter of these two answers; St Luke with the former. The judgment then that I form is that the present section must, in Q, have closely followed the other two, but that there was there no explanation of the circumstances which elicited the saying; so that the section was one which there was no inconvenience in transposing.

Considered merely as a parable, it is one capable of many applications of which our daily experience gives illustrations. Whether in the case of one suffering from a chronic disease, or from a permanent evil habit, recovery becomes never so hopeless, as when a remedy is applied from which good results had been expected, and which for a time seems to have been successful, but which is found to have worked no real cure; when the temporary amelioration is followed by a relapse, leaving the disease more obstinately insensible to treatment. Thus, for example, when one addicted to drinking habits has been convinced of the injury he

is doing himself, and has been induced to take a pledge of abstinence, there is much hope for a time, while his resolution lasts. But when the pledge is broken, perhaps renewed, and broken again, then disappointment tends to pass into despair.

This was one of the problems that perplexed the first rulers of the early Christian Church. In obedience to the mission which their Master had given them of calling sinners to repentance, they had not scrupled to admit into their community many who had been abandoned as irretrievably vicious by those who in their day had the greatest reputation for morality and piety. The Apostle Paul, when speaking of those guilty of gross vices, was able to say to his disciples, *Such were some of you*. We can well understand the change which took place when these scouted profligates became members of a society for which their past was blotted out, where they were owned as brethren, all their strivings after a better life sympathised with and encouraged, where, in the presence of new interests, new affections, and grateful love for benefits conferred, the old temptations lost their power to allure. It must have been otherwise if no new love came to fill the blank which the abandonment of former pleasures had left. After a little time the penalties which their former enjoyment had exacted would be forgotten; and when the temptation was felt again, there would be little inducement to try a way of escape which had ended in disappointment before. Thus it was that one of the earliest controversies in the Church was concerning the possibility of forgiveness for post-baptismal gross sins. The more merciful would allow one plank after shipwreck, but if after that there was relapse, hope of recovery became faint.

Enough has been said to illustrate the applications of this section, considered as a parable. But beside the covert meaning of a parable there is also an obvious one. A story is told which, if it did not really happen, conceivably might have happened. The story here is

of a man from whom a demon had been cast out, but whose cure was not permanent, the demon returning with more power for evil than before. Such a case must have been well within the experience of those whom our Lord addressed. Before our Lord cast out devils, the Jews seem to have had exorcists of their own (Matt. xii. 27 ; Luke xi. 19) ; and if these exorcists had not been sometimes successful the profession could not have been followed. In those forms of mental disease which enable us to have some conception what the phenomena of demoniacal possession must have been like, the sufferer is often obedient to the clear voice of authoritative command. If, however, he has once learnt to disregard it, it loses its influence, and the patient will mock at what he had revered before.

We should prefer to think that if the alleged cure of a demoniac were not permanent, it might be concluded that the demon had never been really expelled. But this view has no sanction from this parable, which speaks of the real expulsion of a demon ; for the instability of the cure is not accounted for by the hypothesis that the exorcist had been an impostor, but the fault is made to rest with the patient himself, who, after the intruder had been dispossessed, left the house empty. We need not therefore restrict the possibility of such an occurrence to the case of Jewish exorcists. We can imagine such a case also occurring to the disciples, who had been sent round the neighbouring small towns, and were able proudly to report to their Master that they had found the demons subject to them in His name. It may have happened to them afterwards to encounter one whom they had accounted cured, but had left without further instruction, and that finding him now more intractable than he had been, they asked our Lord for an explanation.

Possibly we may use this section to throw light on the statement (Mark xvi. 9 ; Luke viii. 2) that our Lord had cast seven devils out of Mary Magdalene ; and we may infer that this was a case of the cure of a relapsed

demoniac. We might imagine that she was one whose cure had been made worse by the exorcisms of the disciples, but had yielded to the voice of our Lord. At all events we might infer that the relapse of a demoniac had been found to be no impossible occurrence, when we find our Lord (Mark ix. 25) making to His command to a demon to depart, the addition, *and enter no more into him.*

THE MESSAGE OF THE BAPTIST

I return now to a section of Q which I have not dealt with earlier, because I have been following the order of St Mark, who has not incorporated it with his narrative. But since it relates to what took place while John the Baptist was still alive, it must have had an early place in Q, and so it has in St Luke's Gospel. St Matthew places before this incident our Lord's charge when sending out His Apostles. But as I wish to follow St Mark's order when I can, I postpone the consideration of that charge until I come to the corresponding place in Mark. I have already pointed out (p. 41) that though St Mark has omitted the section of the Baptist's message, yet he shows acquaintance with it, and has derived from it the reference to the prophecy of Malachi which he quotes in the beginning of his Gospel. It is easy to see why abridgment should naturally fall on the sections which relate to John the Baptist. The Aramaic Gospel, which according to tradition came first, must have been written for Jews, who had heard the fame of John before they had been told anything of Jesus; and with many of them the testimony of John was a principal cause of their becoming our Lord's disciples. But St Mark had to prepare a Gospel for Gentiles, who only knew of John, because he had been the precursor of Jesus. The story

of John's career had only a historical interest for them, and did not need to be told at such length as for the generation which had known John as a living power.

MATT. xi. 2, 3.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ πέμψας διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν.

LUKE vii. 18-20.

Καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν Ἰωάννῃ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ πάντων τούτων. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐπέμψεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον λέγων, Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; παραγενόμενοι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες εἶπαν, Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς σέ λέγων, Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;

Although in what follows there is such verbal identity between Matthew and Luke as to show that both are using a common written document, yet in these introductory verses St Luke is not copying, but telling the story in his own words. It was necessary that he should use an introduction of his own in order to connect the Baptist's message with the miracle at Nain, his account of which he derived, not from Q, but from another source. This account of the raising of a dead man is a fit preface for the νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται of our Lord's answer. St Matthew had previously told of the raising of Jairus' daughter, but this miracle has a later place in Luke.

The conclusion that St Luke's introduction is his own composition is confirmed by our finding in it traces of Luke's phraseology. For instance we may set down παραγενόμενοι and οἱ ἄνδρες. What would be the most decisive evidence of all is weakened by a variation of reading. From the very beginning of the Christian Church its Founder was known in it as ὁ κύριος. By this title He is constantly called in the Apostolic Epistles and in the Acts; but in the very earliest records of His life, though He is represented as ordinarily receiving the respectful address κύριε, yet when He is spoken of historically, it is always by His proper name Ἰησοῦς. In the Fourth Gospel the title ὁ κύριος is freely used of Jesus after His crucifixion. Three times within a few verses in chapter xx., the report of the Resurrection

comes from those who say that they had seen *the Lord*. But this use of the title only occurs once in the earlier chapters (iv. 1), *When the Lord knew how that the Pharisees had heard, etc.*; and even there \aleph D and other Western authorities correct what seems to have been felt as an impropriety of language, and for *the Lord* substitute *Jesus*. It is therefore no decisive proof of spuriousness that the title \acute{o} $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is used in the appendix to Mark, though not in the earlier chapters. St Luke, in his Gospel, probably influenced by the example of earlier Gospels, as a general rule abstains from using this title when relating the work of the Saviour's active ministry, but is evidently so accustomed to the use of it, that he employs it occasionally in additions of his own to what had been narrated in Q, e.g. vii. 13; x. 1.

In this verse (vii. 19), according to our oldest witnesses, we have \acute{o} $\text{Ἰωάννης ἔπεμψεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον}$, and we seem to have a distinct proof of Lucan origin. But according to what soon became the Received Text, as judged of by the multitude of authorities, including \aleph , which adopted it, instead of $\pi\rho\acute{o}s\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ we have $\pi\rho\acute{o}s\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \text{Ἰησοῦν}$. I think we need not doubt that the older witnesses have here preserved for us the genuine text of Luke. But how then are we to account for the reading which obtained the greatest circulation? We could understand transcribers substituting, without authority, for the primitive Ἰησοῦς the more reverential appellation \acute{o} $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$; but is the converse change equally probable? We have seen, however, in the case of John iv. 1, that it was not impossible that a sense of historical propriety might suggest such an alteration. But in this present case, we must remember that we are dealing with a passage in Q, and that it is only in St Luke's use of it that the title \acute{o} $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is used. So that it is very conceivable that the appellation used in the earlier Gospel should remain in the Church recitation of the history.

Having said so much about St Luke's introduction to this anecdote, I return to St Matthew's, in which we

read, that John heard in the prison the works of *the Christ*, the article being well attested. *Christ* is not used in this Gospel as a proper name; and we cannot interpret this verse otherwise than that John had heard that Jesus was doing such works as the Messiah was to perform. If so, then why did he hesitate? what need of messengers? Jesus only answered these messengers by enabling them to bear testimony that He was actually doing what had been predicted of the Messiah; and the concluding words, *Blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me*, certainly seem to imply blame of the Baptist's hesitation.

It is then most natural to conjecture that John, in his lonely imprisonment, at the mercy of an unscrupulous tyrant, felt that if this were indeed *He that should come*, He would already have done something *to proclaim release to the captives, and to set at liberty them that were bruised*. It may be indeed that what the Baptist had as yet heard of the mighty works of Jesus had not been sufficient to inspire full faith in Him; for what the Evangelists have recorded of Him, as prior to this message of John, does not seem to have as yet inspired His immediate disciples with the belief that this was indeed the Christ. Jesus therefore now contents Himself with enabling the messengers to report that He was doing such works as Isaiah (xxxv. and lxi.) had predicted of the Messiah. One who accepted this evidence must not be scandalised, even though the real Messiah differed much from what it had been imagined He should be.

Coming now to discuss the message sent by John, we have to consider a curious diversity of reading, of no importance as far as the text is concerned, but in which almost the same MSS. are ranged on opposite sides as in the case of the variation which we have had just before us, between the readings τὸν κύριον and Ἰησοῦν. The Baptist's message as reported by St Matthew is, Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; and with this, according to the oldest MSS., Luke verbally agrees (vii. 19); but in the great bulk of the authorities

instead of *ἕτερον* we have *ἄλλον*. The curious point however is that, as St Luke relates the history, the Baptist's message is twice repeated: first in verse 19, where his messengers are commissioned to ask the question, and secondly in verse 20, where they actually do so. We should expect the two versions to coincide, and to find the disciples executing their commission with the verbal fidelity of a Homeric messenger. But in point of fact the best critical editors now represent John as instructing his disciples to say, *ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν*; and the disciples as actually saying, *ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν*; and yet the MSS. are all but unanimous in making no difference between the two cases. In verse 19 we have the oldest authorities, B & and their usual allies, in favour of *ἕτερον*, in agreement with Matthew, while A with a numerically larger array of witnesses supports *ἄλλον*. In verse 20 the witnesses are ranged in the same way, with the important exception that B turns round and allies itself with the witnesses it had opposed before, while & holds its ground.

I hold that the anomalous appearance which the text of B presents is to be accounted for by the use of different sources. I consider that St Matthew's text (Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19), with *ἕτερον*, preserves for us the form in which the story was told in Q, which for some time kept its place in Church reading. Luke vii. 20, where the reading *ἄλλον* is best attested, is an addition made to the story by St Luke, and I regard *ἄλλον* as his word. If I had to account for his use of it I should say it arose from a feeling on the part of the Evangelist that *ἕτερον* was more properly used when only two things were spoken of. But if so, should we not expect to find St Luke's word *ἄλλον* in verse 19 also? If, with Hort, we accept B's account as representing the true text of Luke, we must suppose that in the mind of the Evangelist *ἄλλον* and *ἕτερον* conveyed so completely the same idea that there was no inconvenience in using different words in two consecutive verses giving a report of the same message.

OUR LORD'S ANSWER TO JOHN'S DISCIPLES

MATT. xi. 4-6.

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ὃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται· καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἂν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

LUKE vii. 21-23.

Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς ἀπὸ νόσων καὶ μαστίγων καὶ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν, καὶ τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ὃ εἶδετε καὶ ἤκούσατε· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται· καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

St Luke here states that on receiving this message, Jesus immediately, in sight of the messengers, healed many of diseases and other scourges, cast out evil spirits, and gave sight to many blind. It does not appear to me that this had been expressly told in Q, though the words in our Lord's answer, ὃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε, sufficiently imply that besides what the messengers would be told of previous miracles of our Lord, they were allowed to witness some for themselves. And St Luke seems to have thought it necessary that mention of the latter should be made in his narrative. The words νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται deserve attention. It is not stated by either authority that any dead person was raised on this occasion, so that the raising of the dead must be counted as one of the things which John's disciples *heard* rather than *saw*. But St Matthew, in an earlier chapter (ix. 18), had told of the raising of Jairus' daughter; St Mark however (v. 22), has given this miracle a later place in his narrative; and St Luke (viii. 41) follows Mark. But as St Luke relates the story of the raising of the widow's son at Nain, he is able, without impropriety, to give to the mission of John's disciples the same earlier place in the history that St Matthew has done.

OUR LORD'S DISCOURSE CONCERNING JOHN

MATT. xi. 7-19.

LUKE vii. 24-35.

The opening verses of this discourse (Matt. xi. 7-11 ; Luke vii. 24-28) being almost verbally identical in our two sources need not be commented on from the point of view of the present investigation. In these verses there is so much coincidence between Matthew and Luke in the use and collocation of unusual words, that we cannot doubt that both versions have a common written source. The variations are scarcely important enough to deserve mention. They all seem to me to need no other explanation than that they were introduced by St Luke in his way of telling the story.

At this point St Luke breaks off his copying of Q, and interposes a statement in his own words (vv. 29, 30), as to the reception of this discourse, viz., that it was heard gladly by the publicans and others who had flocked to John's baptism, but was rejected, to their own detriment, by the Pharisees and lawyers who had previously refused discipleship with John. St Luke then returns to agreement with Matthew in the verses Matt. xi. 16-19 ; Luke vii. 31-35, where the different reception by the Jews of John and of Jesus is compared to the conduct of wayward children.

If we are to accept St Matthew's narrative as an accurate representation of the story told in Q, we must hold that St Luke has omitted here four verses which we now consider. The first two of these verses must be referred to Q, for they are also found in Luke, but in a different place, and with considerable alteration.

MATT. xi. 12-15.

Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάξουσιν αὐτήν. πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφήται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου ἐπροφήτευσαν· καὶ εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας ὁ μέλλων ἐρχεσθαι. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούτω.

LUKE xvi. 16.

Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτήν βιάζεται.

That both these versions had a common source in Q need not be doubted; the only question is what place in Q they occupied; and this is an important question as regards the interpretation; for this saying of our Lord's is an extremely difficult one, and we should be in a better position to say what lesson He wished to convey, if we knew the occasion on which the words were spoken. In Matthew, whatever difficulty there may be about the interpretation, there seems to be none about the connexion: these verses seem to be a natural continuation of our Lord's discourse about John the Baptist. In Luke, on the other hand, there is no part of his Gospel where the sequence of thought is so hard to apprehend. Chapter xvi. begins with the parable of the Unjust Steward, ending with the lesson, *Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness*; and we are at no loss to trace the connexion of ideas which leads to the use of this word *mammon*; again, *Ye cannot serve God and mammon*. Then we are told that the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, scoffed at Him, and He taught them how what would gain great honour among men might be abomination in the sight of God.

Then follows the verse now under consideration, *The law and the prophets were until John, etc.*, where it requires some ingenuity to make the connexion throw light on the interpretation. But next comes a saying, also found in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 18), *It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fail*. Here again the connexion is not obvious, save that there is a mention of *the law* in both. But we are still more startled when we go on to the next verse, *Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery*, where the sequence of thought is indeed hard to trace. And thus we are led up to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Yet, however great the selfish worldliness of the rich man, no intimation is given that unfaithfulness to his wife was one of his faults.

It seems to me that the best explanation we can give of the dislocation of thought in this little section of Luke is that the Evangelist is here weaving into his narrative different sayings of Jesus which had been recorded in Q, but without indication of the occasions on which they were spoken; and that therefore if we are to aid ourselves by the context in the interpretation of this difficult saying, it is the context as given by St Matthew, and not that as given by St Luke that we have to look to.

But now we have to consider whether even the order in Matthew really represents the order of Q. One difficulty at once occurs to us, that if St Luke, who also used Q, had found this saying about John the Baptist related in connexion with the discourse concerning John delivered on the departure of John's disciples, he would scarcely have omitted to record it in its proper place, but instead have dealt with it as an isolated saying of our Lord, for which he had to find a place as best he could. And on the other hand, we must take into account that if this saying had been reported in Q, without any account of the circumstances under which it was uttered, the place that St Matthew has assigned it is that which any editor would most naturally give it.

Notwithstanding the extreme suitability of Matt. xi. 12 to be read in connexion with the verses immediately preceding, there is a difficulty which I feel very strongly against assigning this verse to the same period of our Lord's life as the preceding verses. These were spoken while John, though in prison, was still alive; yet in this verse our Lord says, *From the days of John the Baptist until now*. Was not this *now* to be included among *the days of John the Baptist*? Though his activity had been suspended by imprisonment, there had been nothing at the time to forbid the hope that he might be released and might resume his work. Thus it may be argued that these words were more likely to have been spoken after the Baptist's death. On this account I do not

venture to reject the inference suggested by the place which St Luke has given this verse, namely, that he did not find it in Q connected with the mission of the Baptist's disciples, but either as an isolated saying of our Lord, or else as connected with two other references by our Lord to the Baptist, Matt. xvii. 13, and xxi. 25.

The form corresponding in Luke to Matt. xi. 12, has the air of being derived from it, while it softens some of the harshness of expression. The word *βιάζεται* is retained, but in the middle voice, not the passive; the Kingdom of God not *βιάζεται*, but *εὐαγγελίζεται*, and instead of calling those who get possession of it *βιασταί*, we have *every one* described as pressing into it. Our Lord did not shrink from using startling forms of expression, if thereby He could arrest the attention of His hearers and impress His words on their memory. But it is not likely that those who reported His sayings would gratuitously import into them a difficulty which had not existed before. Thus the form in Matthew bears a greater air of originality than that in Luke.

The remainder however of the passage, Matt. xi. 14, 15, must be placed early in our Lord's history. It must be referred to a time when He was preparing the minds of His disciples for an announcement of His Messiahship, but had not yet explicitly made it to them. There were two things which, according to Jewish expectation, must precede the coming of the Messiah: there must be a sign from heaven, and Elijah must first come. The thought that Jesus was the Messiah must have occurred to the disciples before their Master had given them His assurance that it was so; but if they expressed this idea to any of the ruling party, they were met by the difficulty that neither of these two anticipatory signs had been exhibited. The witnesses of the Transfiguration evidently had their hopes raised high by what they had seen, and then they formally stated the difficulty to their Master (see Mark ix. 11, a section copied by St Matthew, xvii. 10, and which will come under consideration afterwards). The question

now is whether He had not, as St Matthew alone records, given a reply to their difficulty about Elijah on this earlier occasion. That He did so is not disproved by the silence of St Mark, who habitually refrains from lengthening his Gospel by telling two stories of the same kind, and he relates the answer to the difficulty about Elijah in a later place, as I have just mentioned. The silence of St Luke is still less of an objection; for the strange point is that St Luke nowhere identifies John with Elijah, unless indeed we count it an exception that he records the prediction (i. 17) that John was to come in the spirit and power of Elijah. It is still more remarkable that the Fourth Evangelist, who shows himself acquainted with St Mark's Gospel, represents the Baptist as answering, *No*, when asked, *Art thou Elijah?*

I have already (p. 226) had occasion to remark how differently the Baptist was regarded by the Jewish members of the Church, and by the Gentile converts, of whom St Luke was one. We can easily conceive the sensation caused by the preaching of John the Baptist, and the impression which he made on his contemporaries. Unlike to ordinary men in his manner of life, he seemed a revival of one of the prophets of old, especially of Elijah, whom he resembled not only in his garb, but in the boldness with which he rebuked kings. His call to repentance was pronounced with an authority which was felt to be divine; and the faith of the multitudes who recognised it was strengthened by their mutual sympathy. Nor did his preaching provoke the opposition from the ruling classes which our Lord met with. It is an unpopular thing to oppose one who seems to have no other object but to effect moral reformation, and to bring men's conduct into harmony with their professed belief. But it is easy to find good reasons for opposing one who attempts to alter received opinions, or to disparage the authority of accepted teachers. Thus the Baptist's name gathered round it an authority which helped to gain reception for a successor whom

he had approved and recommended. Thus did John really prepare the way for Jesus.

But with Gentile converts the case was just the reverse. With them it was Jesus who prepared the way for John. They did not acknowledge Jesus as a prophet because John had borne testimony to Him ; but, like ourselves, they honoured the memory of John because Jesus had condescended to be baptized by him, and had borne testimony to him as *a prophet and much more than a prophet*. It is intelligible then why St Luke, writing as a Gentile for Gentile readers, should not have cared to dwell on the solution of a difficulty which only existed for Jews. On the other hand, though the Fourth Evangelist frequently speaks of *the Jews* in such a way as to suggest that he did not himself belong to that nation, yet the prominence which he gives more than once to the testimony of the Baptist is one of many indications of his thorough acquaintance with the feelings of the Jews of the first century.

On the whole, I am not sure but that this early place is the most suitable for the declaration that John the Baptist was the predicted Elijah. It evidently belongs to a period before our Lord had announced that He was the Messiah, but when He was leading on His disciples to that belief. It is propounded with the air of one uttering something difficult of reception, but intended to lead on to something still more so : *If ye are willing to receive it. . . He that hath ears to hear, let him hear*. In other words, If John is the forerunner of the Messiah, who then is the Messiah whose way he was to prepare?

THE CHILDREN IN THE MARKET-PLACE

MATT. xi. 16-19.

LUKE vii. 31-35.

A few preliminary words must be said on the formula with which this little parable begins : *Whereunto shall I liken this generation ?* The coincidence of Matthew and Luke shows that it came from Q. It reveals that

illustration was a characteristic of our Lord's method of exposition, and that, in order to make men understand a thing, He felt it to be necessary to compare it to something with which they were acquainted.

Regarding Matthew and Luke as independent witnesses to the contents of Q, I have had no hesitation in assuming that Q was the source of the interrogative formula with which this section commences. In this place we cannot expect testimony from St Mark; for he has omitted this whole narrative concerning the mission of John's disciples, though he attests his knowledge of it by inserting from it, in his prologue, Malachi's prophecy of the forerunner of the Messiah. But St Mark is the main authority for the use of a similar formula in Q, in his introduction to the comparison of the new Kingdom to a grain of mustard seed.

MARK iv. 30.

Πὼς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν
τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ
θώμεν;

LUKE xiii. 18.

Τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεῖα τοῦ
θεοῦ, καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν;

I refer the interrogatory form of this introduction to Q, although we have not here the authority of St Matthew, who omits the whole of this little introduction; and St Luke may possibly have only copied Mark, though he differs from him somewhat in form. But we can safely say that this formula is not St Mark's own; for he never elsewhere uses the verb ὁμοιόω, or even the adjective ὁμοιος; though the verb occurs seven times in Matthew. St Mark was, as we have already seen, acquainted with Q, and may have adopted the interrogative form used elsewhere in that book.

In these verses the coincidences between Matthew and Luke are so numerous and so striking as to be inexplicable except on the supposition of the use of a common source. The points of agreement in the employment of unusual words are too obvious to need to be enumerated; but I cannot help noticing the use of the relative pronoun common to both. St Luke alters St Matthew's παιδίοις καθημένοις . . . ἃ προσφωνοῦντα τοῖς

ἑτέροις λέγουσιν into what seems a more obvious form *καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις*; but I do not think he would have proceeded with ἃ λέγει, if the use of the relative form had not been suggested to him by his original.

There is only one of the differences between Matthew and Luke in this section which needs any other explanation than that the story is repeated by one who does not think himself bound to employ the identical words in which he had heard it, that whereas Luke has *ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*, Matthew omits the *πάντων*, and instead of *τέκνων* has *ἔργων*. Such, at least, is the text of Matthew as given by \aleph , and by the first hand of B. But I confess that though I have considerable faith in the text attested by these authorities, that faith is put to a severe trial in the present case. We are told much of the tendency of copyists to introduce into one Gospel words which properly belong to the parallel passage of another; but it is almost incredible that in this way the true reading should be exterminated from almost all Greek copies. In the present case, a single cursive (124) is the solitary existing Greek witness besides B* \aleph quoted for the reading *ἔργων* in Matthew, though Jerome reports that he had met copies which had this reading. There can be no doubt that the reading *ἔργων* had some very early circulation, the extent of which we are not now in a position to estimate. It would seem that the original scribe of B found *ἔργων* in his archetype, though his adoption of this reading was afterwards corrected as an error. Yet, that the variation is not a copyist's accidental error appears from the *πάντων*, which certainly is part of the text of Luke, and harmonises well with the reading *τέκνων*, but not so well with the reading *ἔργων*; and it is generally allowed that the *πάντων* has no claim to be part of the genuine text of Matthew.

On examining the evidence as a whole, I find it impossible to believe that any variation introduced deliberately or unconsciously by copyists could have

obtained such universal acceptance; and, therefore, I count the variation as being of such antiquity that it must have originated in the public reading of churches before written Gospels had much independent circulation. Any speculation as to the cause of so ancient a variation can only be conjectural. The best guess I can make is that ἔργων was the original reading of Q, but that the phrase *justified by works* sounded harshly in the ears of those who had been taught by Paul; and was replaced in the public reading of their churches by the reading which St Luke has preserved for us, which subsequently became the Vulgate text of Matthew also, though the original reading was slow to disappear. The reading ἔργων seems to me to harmonise better with the whole narrative. I think that the Evangelist John rightly represents our Lord's attitude, v. 36, *The witness which I have is greater than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.* Here when the Baptist enquired what Jesus claimed to be, he was given the practical answer of the exhibition of His miraculous power, from which he was left to draw his own conclusion.

OUR LORD'S TEACHING BY THE LAKE

St Mark in his third chapter tells how our Lord's safety had become endangered when the ecclesiastical rulers in their jealousy sought the aid of the civil government, which was then in the hands of Herod; and were even able to persuade some of His own relatives that He was out of His mind, and ought to be put under restraint. His headquarters at that time appear to have been at Capernaum, which was a centre whence He made circular tours of preaching in other neighbouring places. St Matthew represents

our Lord as coming to dwell in Capernaum after His return from the wilderness (iv. 13), and even (ix. 1) speaks of Capernaum as our Lord's own city. Bernhard Weiss would have us reject this as an error of the Evangelist; but I know no reason why we should regard ourselves as better informed than he.

In the present investigation we confine ourselves to what rests on human testimony; and from the nature of the case we must expect to have much fuller information concerning that part of His ministry when He had enlisted and gathered round Him a company of earnest disciples who assisted Him in His labours, than of the time when He laboured alone. Naturally that period of His ministry, concerning which we have full details, occupies the larger portion in our thoughts, and we are likely to assign to it a larger proportion of time than it really occupied. For this reason I do not find confidence in giving any other answer to those who have inferred from St John's *Thou art not yet fifty years old* (viii. 57), that our Lord's ministry must have been longer than the little more than three years which we usually assign it, than, We have not materials for determining the length of the solitary portion of our Lord's ministry.

I have already pointed out that after St Mark has told of our Lord's move from Capernaum, he goes on, in the latter part of his third chapter, to give further anecdotes of our Lord's work in that city. I consider this as merely arising from the difficulty of harmonising the logical and the chronological order of narration. When St Mark tells of the danger to which our Lord was exposed in Capernaum, it was natural that he should tell of our Lord's withdrawal from the scene of peril; but we must allow some time to elapse before the alliance between the Pharisees and the Herodians became known in the circle of our Lord's disciples, and made them feel the necessity of guarding against the danger which it threatened. What I take to be the fact is that there was a double reason for our Lord's removal from Capernaum, and that the more

obvious was the earlier. In St Mark's third chapter we are told (verse 9) of the inconvenience caused by the pressure of the multitude which the fame of His miraculous cures brought thronging round Him, a pressure which was so continuous that it was difficult to be freed from it long enough to have time to take food. In a small Eastern town it was not easy to find places where a large audience could be addressed, save one which was appropriated to the ordinary business of buyers and sellers. But the open space bordering on the lake could be taken advantage of, and, one of His disciples being the owner of a boat (for we need not doubt that the boat was Simon's), the expedient was resorted to of the Master teaching from a boat while the hearers stood on the shore. This method had the advantage that, by pushing out, the discourse could be broken off when the pressure came to be too exhausting. Thus was avoided the inconvenience which arose when there was no method of escape but returning to a house when the crowd would follow all the way, and then could with difficulty be got rid of. The same expedient could also naturally be used when our Lord's adversaries were anxious to lay hold on Him.

THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER

MARK iv. 1, 2.

Καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλείστος, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν. καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλάς, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ

MATT. xiii. 1-3a.

Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῆς οἰκίας ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ συνήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν ἰστήκει. καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγων

LUKE viii. 4.

Συνιόντος δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευομένων πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν διὰ παραβολῆς

The three Synoptic Gospels agree in relating this parable, and it is natural to conclude that all derived

it from Q. That there is close connexion between Matthew and Mark is unmistakable, the coincidences being even verbal. But the copying, on whichever side it was, has not been slavish. Two explanations of these coincidences may be given: either both of our Evangelists followed Q, each with some variations of his own, and the words common to both may be assumed to be the very words of their common authority, or else we are to add to this assumption, what other instances lead us to think of as possible, that St Matthew was acquainted with St Mark's work, and therefore that common phrases may be accounted for as a mere copying of St Mark's phraseology by St Matthew.

We turn now to Luke, and the chief difference to which we must attend is the different place in the order of events which he gives to this parable. He tells first (viii. 1) of our Lord's starting on an extensive missionary tour accompanied not only by the Twelve, but by women in good position, who in gratitude for benefits which they had received from His miraculous power contributed to the expenses of the party. St Mark's account would rather lead us to think of such extensive tours as coming after the attempts made at Capernaum to silence His preaching. Here we must take notice that St Luke shows no knowledge of the fact about which St Matthew and St Mark agree, that this parable of the Sower was spoken as part of our Lord's teaching from a boat; St Luke only mentions it as an incident on our Lord's preaching tour, without giving any hint where it occurred. And again, concerning the voyage across the lake, on which our Lord rebuked the storm, St Luke shows no knowledge of what St Mark tells, that the voyage was made at the close of a day when our Lord had been preaching from the boat, and that His command to cross the lake was issued by Him without getting out of the boat. It seems likely that He found He could not otherwise free Himself of the crowds, who would continue to follow Him if the boat

was merely rowed along the same side of the lake. Thus it seems to me that notwithstanding many signs that St Luke was acquainted with St Mark's Gospel, the present is one of several indications which appear to show that he did not know it as a document; and I am disposed to regard the facts as rather pointing to the conclusion that St Luke was acquainted with St Mark's Gospel, not through having read it, but through having heard it orally delivered at several meetings at which he was present.

THE WAYSIDE

MARK iv. 3, 4.

Ἀκούετε. ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων σπείραι. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν δὲ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθεν τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

MATT. xiii. 3b, 4.

Ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν. καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν ἃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἔλθοντα τὰ πετεινὰ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.

LUKE viii. 5.

Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν δὲ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ κατεπατήθη καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

The differences between the Evangelists here are insignificant. St Mark differs from the others in prefixing the command Ἀκούετε, which however harmonises with *He that hath ears to hear* at the end. St Matthew and St Mark agree in beginning with ἰδοὺ, which is consistent with the supposition of the use of an Aramaic original. In fact my own belief is that this parable was included in the Aramaic Matthew, and that many of the variations in our Greek Gospels are simply translational, though Church use would naturally lead to many Greek words establishing themselves in the versions given by different readers. Elsewhere τὰ πετεινὰ is so commonly followed by τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, that it may perhaps be counted an agreement between Matthew and Mark that both omit the genitive. Matthew has τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in every other place where πετεινὰ occurs. Mark has it in one other place (iv. 32). Luke has it five times out of six, the only exception being xii. 24.

THE WAYSIDE : THE EXPLANATION

MARK iv. 14, 15.

Ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει. οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.

MATT. xiii. 19.

Παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος, ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ ἄρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς.

LUKE viii. 11b, 12.

Ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, εἰτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.

It is hard, in comparing the Evangelic narratives, to hit the mean between the danger of dwelling too much on trivialities, and of overlooking peculiarities which have a real significance. I think we ought to count in the latter class the difference that, in the first words of this common passage, St Mark speaks of the thing sown simply as *the word*, whereas St Matthew speaks of *the word of the kingdom*, and St Luke of *the word of God*. That is to say, the phrase *the word* has now acquired a technical meaning, and our first conclusion would be that St Mark's was the latest of the three forms. It might be regarded as a confirmation of this view that, as has been already pointed out, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον also is used by St Mark simply as a technical term not needing an explanation as to what *the good tidings* was. But while I freely acknowledge that St Mark here uses what was by comparison a later form of expression, we are bound to remember how very early that form was. I have already pointed this out with respect to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, which St Paul's epistles show to have been early an established phrase in the circle to which St Mark belonged. And much the same may be said of the phrase *the word*, used to denote the subject of the Gospel preaching. St Mark uses it again several times, of which one deserves special notice because it is also employed by St Matthew, *when persecution ariseth because of the word* (Mark iv. 17; Matt. xiii. 21). If the once prevalent view be adopted, that St Matthew's Gospel is the earliest, we

need not be surprised at finding the phrase in established use when St Mark wrote. If, as I believe, St Mark's was the earliest of our three Synoptics, we might take the present coincidence as an indication that his Gospel had been used by St Matthew. But this argument would not be decisive, since there is other evidence how early this phraseology became established. The most striking piece of evidence is that of St Luke, who, though either his sense of historic propriety, or the form in which the traditions had reached him, restrains him from using it when reporting our Lord's discourses, yet employs it in his own preface, when he speaks of those *which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word* (see also Acts viii. 4). And though this use is rare in St Paul, we find him in one of his later Epistles exhorting Timothy to *preach the word* (2 Tim. iv. 2).

The next thing to be noticed is that St Matthew differs from the other two Evangelists in using the participle *σπαρείς* of him who receives the seed, so that the word has to be translated *sown upon*. But St Mark has the same use, though not in this first clause, yet in the other clauses of the parable.¹

He who snatches away the good seed is called by St Mark *Σατανᾶς*; by St Matthew *ὁ πονηρός*; by St Luke *ὁ διάβολος*. *Σατανᾶς* is the name used by St Mark in relating our Lord's temptation, where St Matthew and St Luke both have *ὁ διάβολος*. St Matthew alone of these three Evangelists uses *ὁ πονηρός* as a name for Satan; but this name is used by St Paul, as, for instance, *τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ πεπυρωμένα* (Eph. vi. 16), but more frequently in St John's 1st Epistle.

¹ It may be noted as a point of agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark, though not one on which much stress can be laid, that while Mark, according to the oldest authority, speaks merely of the good seed as sown on the hearers, Matthew and Luke describe it as sown *in their hearts*.

THE ROCKY GROUND

MARK iv. 5, 6.

Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπescen ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες [καὶ] ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς· καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυματίσθη καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη.

MATT. xiii. 5, 6.

Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπescen ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς, ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος ἐκαυματίσθη καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη.

LUKE viii. 6.

Καὶ ἕτερον κατέπescen ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, καὶ φυὲν ἐξηράνθη διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἱκμάδα.

Here the almost complete identity of Matthew and Mark is striking. The greatest difference being that St Mark, followed by St Luke, speaks of the seed in the singular number; St Matthew all through uses the plural. Though the sense conveyed by St Luke's version is the same, the form of expression is quite different. But it is easier to account for St Luke's as a literary compression of St Mark's than for St Mark's as an expansion of St Luke's.

THE ROCKY GROUND : THE EXPLANATION

MARK iv. 16, 17.

Καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν ὁμοίως οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη σπειρόμενοι, οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν, εἴτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται.

MATT. xiii. 20, 21.

Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν· οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστιν, γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται.

LUKE viii. 13.

Οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὗτοι ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται.

Here the resemblance between Matthew and Mark is still very strong, and we are tempted to regard Mark as the original, because of the double occurrence of St Mark's favourite *εὐθύς*. Luke, as before, agrees in sense, but varies in language. His *πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν* seems plainly suggested by Mark's adjective *πρόσκαιροι*. *σκανδαλίζω* is frequently used by St Matthew and St Mark, but not by St Luke, except in passages parallel with these two Gospels. On the other hand,

St Luke is the only Evangelist who uses the word ἀφίστασθαι; and the only close N. T. parallel is 1 Tim. iv. 1; but the word *apostate* remains to testify the full admission of this word into the Christian vocabulary. δέχονται, which St Luke uses here instead of λαμβάνουσιν, may be described as a Lucan word.

THE THORNS

MARK iv. 7.

Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἀκανθαὶ καὶ συνέπνιξαν αὐτό, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν.

MATT. xiii. 7.

Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἀκανθαὶ καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτά.

LUKE viii. 7.

Καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν, καὶ συνφνεῖσαι αἱ ἀκανθαὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό.

THE THORNS: THE EXPLANATION

MARK iv. 18, 19.

Καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες, καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσπορευόμεναι συνπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

MATT. xiii. 22.

Ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου συνπνίγει τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνε-
ται.

LUKE viii. 14.

Τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευόμενοι συνπνίγονται καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦ-
σιν.

We have here the same features of close agreement between Matthew and Mark; and though St Luke's variations indicate independent treatment, the coincidences are enough to prove obligation. ἀναβαίνω, of the coming up of a plant is found also twice in Mark iv., but not elsewhere in the N. T. I do not know whether any inference can be drawn from the fact that in the parable Matthew and Luke agree in ἀπέπνιξαν against Mark's συνέπνιξαν. Luke's συνφνεῖσαι agrees with the φνέν which he alone has in verses 6, 8. The phrase ἐν μέσῳ may be counted especially Lucan, occurring several times in the Gospel and Acts, though not absolutely peculiar to Luke.

THE GOOD GROUND

MARK iv. 8, 9.

Καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν, καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενα, καὶ ἔφε-
 ρεν εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν.
 Καὶ ἔλεγεν, "Ὅς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

MATT. xiii. 8, 9.

"Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν, καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν, ὃ μὲν ἑκατὸν ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.
 Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.

LUKE viii. 8.

Καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν, καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα. Ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει, Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

THE GOOD GROUND: THE EXPLANATION

MARK iv. 20.

Καὶ ἐκείνοι εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπα-
 ρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχου-
 νται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ [ἐν] ἑξή-
 κοντα καὶ [ἐν] ἑκατόν.

MATT. xiii. 23.

Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ συνιείς, ὃς δὴ καρποφορεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ ὃ μὲν ἑκατὸν ὃ δὲ ἑξή-
 κοντα ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.

LUKE viii. 15.

Τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρ-
 δία καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκού-
 σαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχου-
 σιν καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

These concluding verses do not modify the results suggested by those that precede them. Instead of τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν of Matthew and Mark, Luke, though agreeing in respecting the article, has ἀγαθὴν instead of καλὴν. He has καλῇ, however, when the adjective is repeated in the explanation. It is likely that καλὴν was the adjective used in Q, with which the word seems to have been a favourite, see for instance Matt. iii. 10; vii. 17, 18, 19, where the phrase καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν is used four times. καρποὺς διδόναι is the more common phrase, but ποιεῖν is found in the present passage in Mark, and also in its parallels in Matthew and Luke. παραδέχομαι does not occur again in the Gospels, but is used by St Luke three times in the Acts.

On the whole, of all passages common to the three Synoptics, there is none which bears more distinct marks that the three versions have been derived from the same original than this parable of the Sower. We have then good reason for concluding that this parable had been reported in Q; but the question arises, Did it there stand alone? In Luke it does stand alone; in

Matthew it is followed by six others. In Mark it is followed by others, only one of them however (that of the Grain of Mustard Seed) being included in Matthew's six, and having rather the aspect of having been preserved by an independent tradition, than by compression of the source here used by St Matthew. Yet in favour of the view that the common source of Matthew and Mark here contained a collection of parables, may be urged St Mark's own acknowledgment, that the parables he records were only a selection from a larger number: *With many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it* (verse 33). Yet again, in favour of the view that the collection of parables in Matt. xiii. must be regarded as the work of the "redactor" of the First Gospel, there is to be urged the literary skill which this "redactor" elsewhere shows in his presentation of our Lord's discourses.

Both solutions are possible from a critical point of view: either that the systematic arrangement of topics had been made by our Lord Himself, and only does not appear in all the reports, on account of the fragmentary manner in which of necessity His sayings were preserved, or else that it was the Evangelist who skilfully put together kindred utterances delivered by our Lord on different occasions. If we adopt the latter view, we should be inclined to attribute to that Evangelist the joining the parable of the Sower with these other parables of our Lord, and to account for St Luke's silence in this place about the others by his non-acquaintance with St Matthew's Gospel.

THE REASON FOR OUR LORD'S METHOD OF TEACHING BY PARABLES

MARK iv. 10-13. MATT. xiii. 10-15. LUKE viii. 9, 10.

In this section the report both of our Lord's question and of the disciples' answer is so much abridged in Luke,

that if we had not the help of the other Evangelists, we should have a difficulty in seeing the relevance of our Lord's answer. But we find from Matthew that the question was a more comprehensive one, and that the disciples desired to know why He spoke to the multitude in parables; for St Matthew and St Mark agree in telling that the explanation of the parables was not given publicly to the multitude, but afterwards to the disciples when they were alone. If the disciples' request had been merely, as St Luke reports it, to be taught the meaning of the parable of the Sower, the quotation from Isaiah and the distinction between the privileges of the disciples and of the outside multitude are introduced irrelevantly, while they are distinctly appropriate to the question as given by St Matthew, *Why speakest thou unto them in parables?* St Mark's report is also abridged, though not nearly as much so as St Luke's. We might hastily infer from Mark that *the Sower* was the first of our Lord's parables, or at least the only one spoken on this occasion. I have already pointed out that St Mark himself intimates (iv. 33, 34) that *the Sower* was but one of several parables addressed to hearers according to their capacity of profiting by them. We may observe also that the form in which the enquiry of the disciples is reported by St Mark is that they asked their Master concerning *the parables*, where the use of the plural number shows that more than one had been spoken, and that the question was, as the answer given to it shows, not merely concerning the meaning of one parable, but concerning the general method of teaching by parables.

Again, in the conclusion of St Mark's report of our Lord's preface to His answer He is represented as asking, *Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?* This question has often been understood as a reproach to the disciples for their dullness in needing an explanation; yet the whole context leads us to think that those whom He regarded as worthy of reproach were careless hearers, who listened

to the story without enquiring whether it had a deeper meaning, not those who sought to have explained to them the meaning which they had not been able at once to apprehend. Again, this question would have been more pertinent, if explanation had been asked of one of the easiest of the parables: "You do not understand this one, and how can you expect to understand others more difficult?" But in fact while many of the parables so plainly convey the lesson they were meant to teach that explanation seems scarcely necessary, in this case, if our Lord had not Himself given us a commentary, we might have been puzzled to decide why He should have told this story about the husbandman.

It is better then to regard Mark iv. 13 as answering a question put in the form reported by St Mark, viz., in the plural number, concerning *the parables*; and that, instead of giving them a general answer, He points out that it is necessary that they should be first made fully to understand the meaning of one parable. It seems to me then likely that Q may have contained not only the parable of the Sower, but some others too in the same connexion, amongst which may have been the Grain of Mustard Seed, which is the only one of the parables in Matt. xiii. which has its place on the same occasion in either of the other Gospels. And it is to be noted that after this and its companion parable St Matthew too makes a break, the remaining parables related in this chapter being described as delivered, not to the multitude, but to the disciples in private. But I feel we must not leave out of sight the fact that St Matthew's arrangement of topics is much more ruled by the kindred character of the subjects treated of than by chronological considerations. If we supposed that St Matthew and St Mark meant to give an account of the preaching on one particular day, we should find our authorities in contradiction. According to St Matthew, when our Lord had finished His public preaching He retired to a house, and there gave His disciples the interpretation of the parable of the Tares,

and taught them some other parables; according to St Mark, He escapes the pressure of the multitudes, not by withdrawing to a house, but by crossing the lake in the boat just as He was.

We can reconcile our authorities by supposing that St Matthew's introduction to the parable of the Tares does not necessarily imply that this parable was spoken on the same occasion as that of the Sower: *Another parable set he before them* (xiii. 26). And indeed it seems to me that this parable was too important to have been omitted by St Mark and St Luke, if their authorities had given it in the same connexion. In St Mark's Gospel too, his use of the imperfect tense cautions us against assuming that all the sayings which he records consecutively formed part of a connected discourse. In all the rest of this chapter we have a continual repetition of ἔλεγεν, as each successive utterance of our Lord is recorded, see verses 11, 21, 24, 26, 30; and it is only in the next chapter that the Evangelist resumes his habitual use of the present or aorist. We need not then tax our ingenuity to make more connexion between consecutive verses than on the face of them they exhibit. On the other hand, the preference for the imperfect tense is so common with St Mark that I feel it is rather on the other side we must be cautious: viz., lest we should take what may have been a mere trick of style for a designed warning that we are not to regard the narrative as consecutive.

If St Luke does not report the question why our Lord spoke in parables, we must remember that when he wrote, Christians were familiar, as we all are now, with many parables of our Lord, and that while we should be glad to be assured that we rightly interpret any particular parable, it seldom occurs to us to put the question, Why did He speak in parables at all? Some would now answer, Because it was a way usual among the Jews of conveying moral lessons; but we find here that this answer is wrong. The method no doubt was not unprecedented, for we find parables,

though very few in number, in the Old Testament ; but when Jesus used it, it struck the hearers by its novelty. It had evidently not become an established form of instruction ; indeed if it had been so, it would, when sanctioned by our Lord's employment of it, have become the regular use of Christian preachers ; but in point of fact it remained our Lord's own, and did not succeed in any hands but His.

If in answering the question why our Lord spoke in parables, we were to consider only His human nature, we should need no other answer than, because it was the method of conveying His instructions which came most naturally to Him, and which therefore He could use most effectually. We might as well enquire why Ovid, or why Pope, taught their lessons in a metrical form. It was because they found their thoughts most naturally threw themselves into such a form, and because when so expressed they were most effective and most easily remembered. And I do not think that the acknowledgment of His Divine nature materially alters the problem. He assumed not only humanity in general, but also an individual human form. That is to say, while He was like other men in those attributes which all men have in common, He must have had individual features by which He could be recognised. It has no doubt been wisely ordained that no authentic portrait of Him has been preserved. But artists have not been thought wanting in faith in Him because they have attempted to represent in painting how they imagined He must have appeared in the eyes of men. Now it would be Apollinarianism to hold that it was only in outward appearance He was like other men, and had not an individual human mind. In fact if we own Him to have assumed a human body, that must have included a human brain with its individuality. And concerning the mind of Jesus we have in His recorded discourses evidence to which there is nothing corresponding in the case of His outward appearance. We know that He possessed great fertility in illustration,

so that when He desired to make His hearers understand anything it was natural for Him to ask, *Whereunto shall we liken it? or with what comparison shall we compare it?*

The only thing that seems to need comment is that His answer conveys the impression that He represented Himself, not as using parables in order to enable His hearers to understand, but in order to hide His meaning from those who were unworthy of His lessons. Indeed there are some of His parables which fulfil the former object so perfectly as not to require any explanation. Who, for example, needs a commentator on the parable of the Unmerciful Servant, in order to make him understand the unseemliness, when one who is much in need of pardon himself refuses it to lesser offenders? But in the case of the parable of the Sower, which seems to have been the first of which the disciples asked an explanation, the lessons taught are much less obvious; and the need for them would be little felt until they themselves came to be teachers. Then they might naturally have been disheartened at finding how much of their labour was expended without any profitable result; and it would give them courage when they discovered that the same had been the experience of their Master. The same parable contained a lesson for the hearers as well as for the teachers; for when they were taught how much the produce of the seed depended on the soil into which it was cast, they felt the practical urgency of the exhortation, *Take heed how ye hear* (Luke viii. 18).

The parable answers the question put by the disciples, and explains why our Lord used different methods of teaching, with them and with the multitude. That He would give special teaching to the Twelve was what might have been expected from His choice of them to be His special companions, and, as the event proved, to be the appointed teachers of His Church. But St Mark tells us (verse 10) that it was not only the Twelve, but οἱ περὶ αὐτόν who questioned Him

concerning the parable, from which we may infer that He did not repel others besides the Twelve who sought from Him special instruction. But our Lord gives us plainly to understand that one reason for His using the parabolic method was because it discriminated between those who really desired to be taught, and the listless crowd who were merely beguiling an idle hour. Many, and possibly most, of the hearers of His parables listened to His stories without ever putting to themselves the question what they meant, or indeed whether they had any deeper meaning. There is nothing surprising in what is the common experience of preachers at the present day, viz., that an illustration which they use, if at all striking, will be remembered easily enough, but that very few retain in their memory what it had been designed to illustrate. Thus this method of teaching by parables discriminated at once between those who were content to listen without understanding, and those whose whole desire was to grasp the deeper meaning. Those who had not cared seriously to attend speedily lost from their memory what little they had heard, while those who knew enough to be anxious to know more had soon their want supplied. It is in consistency with this that we find from St Mark that this parable was prefaced by the call *ἀκούετε*, and closed with *He that hath ears to hear let him hear*.

THE CANDLE AND THE BUSHEL

MARK iv. 21-23.

Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι, Μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ; οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτὸν εἶν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ, οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν. Εἰ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκοῦειν ἀκούτω.

LUKE viii. 16, 17.

Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ.

That St Luke is here following Mark is apparent from his placing this second parable, as St Mark does,

immediately after the parable of the Sower, with which it has no obvious connexion. It may well however have been spoken on the same occasion, as St Mark seems to give us to understand. What St Mark had been dwelling on is that our Lord gave to the disciples whom He had chosen private instruction which was withheld from the multitude. It was natural then that He should at the same time impress on them that what He taught them in secret was not to remain secret. He was lighting a candle, not that it should be *put under the bushel or under the bed*, but that it should give light to the whole house.

It has already been remarked that the occurrence of doublets suggests the use of a double source. The passage just quoted, Luke viii. 16, occurs with but little variation, Luke xi. 33, and I take the explanation to be that in the first passage I have quoted St Luke is following Mark, and that in the second he is quoting directly from Q. The saying is one which is given by St Matthew as part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 15), and there it has a very natural place. Nothing forbids us to suppose that our Lord may have used the same illustration more than once.

There is another kindred example of a pair of sayings common to Matthew and Luke, which may therefore be referred to the source which I have called Q.

MATT. x. 26, 27.

Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς· οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί· καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸ οὐς ἀκούετε, κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων. καὶ μὴ φοβηθῆτε, κ.τ.λ.

LUKE xii. 2-4a.

Οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί ἀκουσθήσεται, καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὐς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμίαις κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβηθῆτε, κ.τ.λ.

This passage has the marks of having been delivered by our Lord on a different occasion from that we have been hitherto considering, and as teaching a different lesson. What is taught here is not the duty of giving wide publicity to the instruction the hearers had received in private, but the certainty that what had been designed

for public benefit would ultimately reach those for whom it was intended. Consequently that those are not to be feared who strive by violence to suppress the teaching; the light cannot be hidden, but must be surely made manifest. In St Luke's version too, the *μὴ φοβηθῆτε* gives the key to the interpretation. But that version bears what I count to be a mark of posteriority, in that those addressed are regarded as the givers, not the recipients of the secret instruction. When St Luke wrote he could not but be struck by the fact that the quiet work of a very small number of preachers had filled the whole world with their doctrine.

MARK iv. 24, 25.

Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε. ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. ὃς γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὃς οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

LUKE viii. 18.

Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε· ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχη, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχη, ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

MATT. xiii. 12.

Ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

There are several other parallels to these verses of Mark, but I place opposite to them what St Luke has in the same place, the comparison as I think plainly showing that St Luke is here using Mark as his authority. I have already said that St Mark's imperfections, *ἔλεγεν*, permit us to suppose that all the sayings here recorded were not uttered on the same occasion; but neither do they forbid us to think that they were, and the precept *Take heed what ye hear*, or as St Luke has it, *Take heed how ye hear*, is a natural sequel to the parable of the Sower, which had pointed out how much the efficacy of the spoken word depends on the receptiveness of those to whom it is addressed. But the next clause, *With what measure ye mete*, contains a saying used by our Lord on other occasions too, the connexion of which with the present discourse is not obvious, and perhaps it was on that account omitted here by St Luke, who had recorded the saying a little before, vi. 38.

MATT. vii. 2.

Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

LUKE vi. 38.

Δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυννόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν. ὃ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

In fact the law of reciprocity here enunciated has manifold applications. In the Sermon on the Mount as reported by St Matthew we are reminded that the harshness or charity we use in our judgment of others is likely to be reciprocated in the judgments they form of us. In Luke vi. 38 we have possibly the application first given to the words, *Give and it shall be given unto you*. The measure in which you give will be the measure of what you have a right to receive; give liberally, and you will receive, not a bare return, but over measure, *good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over*.

This promise of over measure is represented in Mark by καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν, which occurs in Matthew and Luke elsewhere, in a somewhat different connexion, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν (Matt. vi. 33; Luke xii. 31). *Be not anxious for food or raiment, but seek the Kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you*. The plentiful repayment of gifts offered to the Lord is Old Testament doctrine, taught two or three times in the Book of Proverbs, and is dwelt on by St Paul, 2 Cor. ix. 6. The appeal to this law of reciprocity is quite pertinent to its context in this passage of Mark; for the law holds good in spiritual as well as in material things. The appreciation of eloquence or of poetry, the amount of benefit received from instruction, not only in morals, but in any subject of study, depends much on what the hearer himself contributes; and thus obedience to the precept *Take heed how ye hear* is one which brings with it its own reward.

With respect to Mark iv. 25; Luke viii. 18, ὅς γὰρ ἔχει, κ.τ.λ., St Matthew's account (xiii. 12) seems to have been the original of the other two. St Mark has it

as part of the commentary on the parable of the Sower ; and in this St Luke follows him, merely softening the apparent contradiction of taking *that which he hath* from one who has not by substituting *that which he seemeth to have* (or, *thinketh he hath*). The connexion of the clause with what precedes, which is not obvious in St Mark's report, is quite plain in St Matthew's version. After the saying *Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given*, this clause comes in with complete appropriateness. It seems to me that it was St Matthew's καὶ περισσευθήσεται which suggested the προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν of Mark iv. 24. The present saying is reported both by St Matthew and St Luke as used also by our Lord in connexion with another parable, to which it has evidently a close relation, and the passages may here be conveniently compared.

MATT. xxv. 29.

Τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι παντὶ δοθήσεται καὶ περισσευθήσεται· τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

LUKE xix. 26.

Λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται.

THE SEED GROWING SECRETLY

MARK iv. 26-29.

This parable, peculiar to Mark, has a few words in common with St Matthew's parable of the Tares, but only such as necessarily follow from the fact that both parables tell of the sowing of seed and of a subsequent harvest. But there seems to me no ground for suspecting that either Evangelist worked out a second parable on the lines suggested by the other. St Mark does not profess to give more than a selection of our Lord's parables ; and we have no reason to think that St Matthew's fuller collection in chapter xiii. was intended to be regarded as complete. So it is not wonderful if St Mark should have chosen to insert here one which he found in Q, but which St Matthew had omitted,

perhaps on account of some general resemblance to a longer one which he had given already.

Both parables belong to the same group in which our Lord illustrates the characteristics of what St Matthew calls the *Kingdom of heaven* and St Mark the *Kingdom of God*. The disciples expected that the establishment of that Kingdom would be something startling and sudden, such as Jesus later taught them His second coming would be. But now He teaches them that the Kingdom He was then founding would be a silent growth, like the produce of a seed sown, which needs no further co-operation from man, but sprouts and rises while he may sleep, and from day to day scarcely observe its progress, until, showing itself ripe for harvest, it warns him that the time has come for him to put in the sickle.

This lesson was one that the disciples must have needed from the first, in order to moderate their mistaken expectations; but it was at a much later period that it would be discovered that within the Kingdom itself evils would spring up, the origination of which, as well as their toleration by the Divine Founder of the Kingdom, demanded explanation. I own I have always felt it as a problem demanding explanation that our Lord should have dealt with this topic at so early a period of His ministry. Even the parable of the Sower seems likely to have suggested itself only after a long course of but partially successful preaching. Yet a human teacher must after a time have felt disappointment at his poor success; and might have tried to account for it by the want of attention of his hearers. But no ordinary founder of a new system would begin by giving warning of its partial failures. We could understand the teacher expelling from his company a follower whose conduct had disappointed him, but not so his perception of the evils of premature expulsion. If we reject the explanation that it was our Lord's divine fore-knowledge which enabled Him to do so, we have to choose between two solutions, neither of which

is satisfactory. I find it difficult to believe either that the lesson taught in the parable of the Tares was needed in our Lord's own lifetime, or else that at the time when the tares did manifest themselves any later disciple could give this account of them, and throw it into the form of a parable, a form in which our Lord's example found no imitators.

THE GRAIN OF MUSTARD SEED

MARK iv. 30-32.

MATT. xiii. 31, 32.

LUKE xiii. 18, 19.

This parable of the Grain of Mustard Seed has the same tendency as that one which Mark alone reports, namely, to dispel discouragement at the little show and small beginnings of the new Kingdom, which, nevertheless, was destined to grow into a mighty empire. This parable is found in all three Synoptics, and certainly came from their common source Q. In Mark and Luke it begins with the formula on which I have commented already, *How shall we liken the kingdom of God?* and we might perhaps suppose that St Luke had copied Mark; but when we look a little further, we find that it is not Mark, but Q which St Luke is using as his authority. In the first place, he forsakes St Mark's order, and instead of telling this parable along with the rest with which St Mark places it, and which are used in St Luke's eighth chapter, he does not tell this until the thirteenth. Again, he joins to the parable of the Mustard Seed a kindred parable about Leaven, which St Mark has omitted, but which is found in the same connexion in Matthew. And, lastly, whereas St Mark simply speaks of the mustard seed as sown, St Matthew says that a man sowed it *in his field*, or, as St Luke has it, *in his own garden*. So I conclude that St Matthew and St Luke both used Q, and that St Mark used it too, but with abridgments and omissions as is his wont. St Luke, however, omits a point in which Matthew and

Mark agree, namely, the contrast between the smallness of the mustard seed and the greatness of the plant that springs from it.

MARK iv. 33, 34.

Καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν· χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλενεν πάντα.

MATT. xiii. 34, 35.

Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις, καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, Ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, κ.τ.λ.

This remark comes in St Mark's Gospel in what we should be disposed to consider its natural place; viz., at the end of the series of parables which the Evangelist has selected for narration. It notifies to the reader that the parables which have been related were but a selection from many others of the same kind; it declares that what was related of our Lord in the case of the parable of the Sower, of which the explanation was not given until our Lord was alone with His disciples, was His general method; viz., to speak in parables to the multitude, and interpret them privately to His disciples. And the words *as they were able to hear it* point to the reason for this difference; namely, that His instruction was proportioned to the intelligence of the hearers, and their anxiety to learn. We may note in passing the phrase peculiar to Mark, *Spake he the word unto them*.

I do not think that we can positively say whether St Matthew derived this account of our Lord's method from Mark, or both from Q. In favour of the former view may be urged that the remark which St Mark makes at the end of his series of parables is placed by St Matthew in the middle of his, yet still almost exactly in St Mark's place, namely, after the parable of the Grain of Mustard Seed. But it may be said in reply that it is not correct to say that Matthew's remark comes in the middle, whereas it is really at the end of the series of parables which were spoken publicly. St Matthew mentions no change of place after verse 43; and the parables recorded in the following verses may be regarded as not spoken to the multitude, but to His

disciples ; and verse 51 would show that He supposed them to be intelligible to His audience. Moreover if St Matthew is copying Mark he leaves out the second half of Mark iv. 34. I have already expressed myself as inclined to the opinion that the Old Testament quotation in Matt. xiii. 35 was not derived from Q, but added by the Greek Evangelist.

THE CROSSING OF THE LAKE

MARK iv. 35, 36.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν
ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας
γενομένης, Διέλθωμεν εἰς
τὸ πέραν. καὶ ἀφέντες
τὸν ὄχλον παράλαμβανου-
σιν αὐτὸν ὥς ἦν ἐν τῷ
πλοίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν
μετ' αὐτοῦ.

MATT. viii. 18 & 23.

Ἴδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὄχλον
περὶ αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελ-
θεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς
πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ
οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

LUKE viii. 22.

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν
ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη
εἰς πλοῖον καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ
αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐ-
τούς, Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ
πέραν τῆς λίμνης, καὶ
ἀνήχθησαν.

St Mark returns now to relate the events of the evening of a day when Jesus had taught the people out of a boat (iii. 9 ; iv. 1). The crowd still beset Him ; so He ordered His disciples to cross over to *the other side*. St Luke, who in this narrative closely follows Mark, adds for greater clearness *the other side of the lake*. St Mark goes on to say that the disciples, *leaving the multitude, take him with them, even as he was, in the boat*. It will be remembered that Jesus was already in the boat. So we are to understand that the disciples get in, and take Him across, without His disembarking, which would have forced Him again to suffer the pressure of the multitude.

St Mark adds another autoptic touch, viz., that other boats accompanied Him. If we ask how other boats came to wish to cross at the same time, the best reason I can suggest is that as we are told that many of the people who thronged our Lord came from a distance, we may suppose that several of His hearers had crossed from the other side of the lake, and that they returned

home when His instruction for the day was ended. We are not told how these other boats fared in the storm. It is possible that we hear nothing about them, because they had parted company before the storm burst forth. They probably went at a different pace from that of the fishing boat.

It might have some bearing on a theological question if we had here fuller information. Many divines in ancient and modern times have compared the Church to Noah's Ark, in which those who found a place, and they only, escaped perishing. I remember hearing a sermon from Archer Butler, in which he founded a charitable hope for dissenters on the fact that besides the ship in which Jesus was there were also other little ships. But we should like to know whether the little ships got safe to land.

THE STORM ON THE LAKE

MARK iv. 37-41.

Καὶ γίνεται λαίλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου, καὶ τὰ κήματα ἐπέβαλλον εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ὥστε ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον. καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων· καὶ ἐγείρουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; καὶ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσῃ, Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο. καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί δειλοὶ ἐστε; οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν; καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν, καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, οὗτος καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ;

MATT. viii. 24-27.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμός μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν. καὶ προσελθόντες ἤγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Κύριε, σώσον, ἀπολλύμεθα. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί δειλοὶ ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. Οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες, Ποταπὸς ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν;

LUKE viii. 23-25.

Πλεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσεν. καὶ κατέβη λαίλαψ ἀνέμου εἰς τὴν λίμνην, καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνεον. προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα· ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ ἐπαύσαντο, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς, Ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;

Comparing the three versions of this story, common to all the Synoptics, I see no clear evidence that St

Luke used any authority but St Mark's account, of which he gives a literary rehandling. We note at once Mark's phrase λαίλαψά ανέμων, where Matthew has σεισμὸς μέγας ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ. St Luke puts the events into more regular order: for example, telling at once that Jesus had gone to sleep, and not reserving the first mention of His sleep until the disciples came to awake Him. He does not give the words of the rebuke to the sea and winds, σιώπα, πεφίμωσο; he minimises the somewhat reproachful cry of the disciples from *Teacher, carest thou not that we perish?* into *Master, master, we perish*. Probably διδάσκαλε and ἐπιστάτα are here only different equivalents for *rabbi*. St Mark everywhere brings out how slow were the hearts of the disciples to learn to trust their Master's power. St Luke softens much the severity of His rebuke to them, *Why are ye fearful? Have ye not yet faith?* into, *Where is your faith?* St Mark says that the waves were beating into the boat so that it was getting full; St Luke compresses all into one word, συνεπληροῦντο. Note St Mark's τίς ἄρα, in which St Luke follows him. I do not think that any of these variations oblige us to suppose that St Luke had an independent source of information.

When we turn to St Matthew's account we do not find the same dependence on Mark's language, as we do in other cases where Mark is the authority whom St Matthew is following. The boat is *hidden* by the waves; the cry is *Save, Lord; we perish*; the rebuke is, *Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?* (ὀλιγόπιστοι) and the story begins with καὶ ἰδοὺ. On the whole, I incline to the conclusion that the story was related in Q, and that St Matthew has preserved much of its language. Some phrases are common to all the accounts: ἐπιτίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ οἱ τοῖς ἀνέμοις . . . καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη [μεγάλη].

This miracle has an important place in the history of the progressive steps by which Jesus revealed His power to His disciples. Their attention was first caught by His power over demoniacs, then St Luke (iv. 39)

tells us how He *rebuked* a fever, and it departed; here we read that inanimate objects were obedient to His command, and that when He rebuked the winds and the waves they submitted. With respect to the effect of the miracle, St Matthew merely says that *the men marvelled*; St Mark says that *they were afraid with great fear*, by which I understand the awe which they felt at being brought into the immediate presence of divine power (see Luke v. 9). St Luke has here what might be taken for a conflation of the other two accounts, φοβήθητεες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν, *being afraid they marvelled*.

OUR LORD'S WOULD-BE FOLLOWERS

MATT. viii. 19-22.

LUKE ix. 57-60.

The story of the man whose desire to follow our Lord was repulsed, is not told by St Mark; but being repeated both by St Matthew and St Luke has to be reckoned with those which I class under the name of Q. It is with the embarkation on this occasion that St Matthew connects it, and therefore it may fitly be considered here; but it was probably told in Q as an isolated anecdote; for St Luke does not connect it with any embarkation, and we should rather be led by him to suppose that the incident took place as our Lord was starting on an ordinary preaching land tour, and probably at a later period in His life. St Luke places it on our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem, and this arrangement is that which most commends itself to us.

We are not bound to suppose that the second anecdote relates an incident which occurred at the same time as that related first. The juxtaposition of the two is sufficiently accounted for by the kindred nature of the subjects. In the first we are told of the repulse of one who had volunteered his companionship, without having counted the cost, and who was ignorant

of the risks and sacrifices which the step would involve. In the other we are told of our Lord's refusal to accept the excuses of one whom He had invited to join Him, but who desired to postpone compliance indefinitely. St Luke does not appear to have had the authority of Q for his addition, *But go thou and publish abroad the kingdom of God.*

St Luke also adds (ix. 61, 62) an anecdote, derived apparently from a different source. If we are to make a distinction between what is here refused, and the farewell feasts permitted to Elisha and to Matthew, I suppose that what was forbidden in these examples was a departure in order to return to former associates from whom it would not be easy again to separate.

THE DEMONIAK IN THE TOMBS

MARK v. 1, 2.

Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν
τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώ-
ραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν. καὶ
ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ
πλοίου [εὐθὺς] ὑπήντησεν
αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄν-
θρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκα-
θάρτῳ.

MATT. viii. 28a.

Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς
τό πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν
τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν ὑπήντη-
σαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζό-
μενοι ἐκ τῶν μνημείων
ἐξερχόμενοι.

LUKE viii. 26, 27a.

Καὶ κατέπλευσαν· εἰς
τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεραση-
νῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντίπερα
τῆς Γαλιλαίας. ἐξελθόντι
δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήν-
τησεν ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ τῆς πό-
λεως ἔχων δαιμόνια.

Comparing in a general way the accounts of the miracle given by the three Evangelists, I find St Luke's entirely founded on St Mark's, of which it is a literary reproduction, containing nothing that might not have been founded on that original. St Matthew's account, on the other hand, is shorter than St Mark's, and at least the foundation of it may conceivably have been more ancient. More disciples than one had been present with our Lord, and more than one may have reported the occurrence. It is quite possible that the story as told, let us say, by St Matthew, was afterwards enlarged by St Mark, in the light of additional information given

him by St Peter, or by some other of those who had been present.

At the beginning we find much variation in the manuscripts as to the name of the district on the other side of the lake, opposite to Galilee, on which our Lord landed. Very good authorities severally describe it as the country of the *Gadarenes*, of the *Gerasenes*, and of the *Gergesenes*. It seems to me that we are only concerned with the question, which was the phrase the Evangelists used, and not which it was that they ought to have used. The most interesting ancient information is obtained from Origen (*Comm. in Johan*, tom. vi. 24). He visited the place, and tried to identify the spot where the miracle occurred: it must have been near the lake, and close to it must have been the cliffs down which the swine ran. It is in this very way that Origen tests the readings of different copies. He makes no attempt to distinguish the report of one Evangelist from that of another; nor does he inform us what was the reading of the manuscripts which he consulted, save that he tells us that he found the reading *Gadarenes* in a few copies, but he does not say what was the reading of the others. In fact his whole interest was absorbed in determining what the locality really was, not what the Evangelists called it.

On examining the documentary evidence, we find the testimony of the oldest manuscripts decisive that *Gadarenes* was the original reading of Matthew, and so it was recognised to be a couple of centuries later than Origen, as we know from the testimony of Epiphanius. Some ancient authorities have *Gazarenes* (so Σ^*) or *Garadenes* (so Δ), a variation which only shows that the copyists had no independent knowledge of the localities, but leaves no room for doubt that *Gadarenes* was the original reading in the text of Matthew. And I think we are also warranted in believing that this was likewise the reading of Q, which I consider, as a general rule, is more closely copied by St Matthew than by St Luke.

Origen objects that Gadara could not have been the

scene of this incident. It was a place well known for its hot springs, but not close to the lake, nor were there any cliffs in the neighbourhood down which the swine could have run. But a proof that Gadara was not *the city* to which the swineherds belonged leaves us quite free to believe that the much frequented springs of Gadara might have given a name to the district, which might have been known on the other side of the lake as the Gadarene country. The hypothesis of a double name was not likely to be resorted to, and people who had learnt from Matthew to speak of the demoniak of Gadara would be apt to retain the same name when using another Gospel. Therefore I am no more impressed by the fact that a number of good manuscripts present *Gadarenes* as the reading of Mark, than I am by the opposing fact that the Latin MSS. generally give *Gerasenes* as the reading of Matthew.

We learn from Origen that there was on that side of the lake an important place called Gerasa; but he contends that it could not have been the scene of the miracle: it was too far east, nearly on the borders of Arabia, and there was neither lake nor cliffs there; yet it seems to me possible that though not the scene of the miracle, it might in popular language have given a name to the district. It was, according to Pliny, one of the ten cities of Decapolis, and it is likely that St Mark conformed to popular usage in substituting *Gerasenes* for the name of the district, instead of the then unfamiliar *Gadarenes*.

Origen's own solution was that the true reading was *Gergesenes*. He found that there was an ancient city called Gergesa situated close to the lake, and having near it cliffs such as the story demanded. This solution was widely accepted, and the reading *Gergesenes* is that of the majority of the MSS., both of Mark and Luke. I think it likely that Gergesa really was the name of the little town to which the swineherds belonged, but it is much to be wished that Origen had told us whether this reading was a mere conjecture of his own, or whether

he had found it in any manuscripts. In the absence of any ancient manuscript evidence in support of it, critics now generally cast it aside as a mere guess of Origen's; yet I find some difficulty in believing that a mere conjecture, though by so eminent a scholar, should have gained such wide acceptance; and considering how small a proportion of the manuscripts of his day Origen could himself have seen, I should not consider his being unable to quote any in support of the reading which he preferred was an absolute proof of the non-existence of any such manuscript. But it must be treated as non-existent until we have clear proof to the contrary. The case is parallel to that of the reading *Bethabara* instead of *Bethany* in John i. 28.

St Matthew's account of this miracle differs from St Mark's by many omissions, of which we shall speak presently; but the most important difference is that Matthew tells of two demoniacs, Mark and Luke only of one. It seems probable that only one had been mentioned in the original form of the story; for if it had told of two it is not easy to see why one should be left out. Demoniacs were not gregarious, and we should not expect to find two of them together. I therefore content myself with accepting St Mark's form of the story, and do not feel myself bound to make conjectural attempts to explain how two should be mentioned in the form of the story reported by St Matthew. In all forms of the story *demons*, in the plural number, are mentioned,—otherwise how could they enter into many swine?—and therefore it was not a violent change to infer that there must have been more demoniacs than one.

We may infer from St Luke's remark that the district of the Gerasenes was *over against Galilee*, that this name for the district was not familiar to his readers. I own that the evidence for Γεργεσηνῶν instead of Γερασηνῶν in Luke is so good that I only retain the latter word because I believe it to be the true reading in Mark; and holding that St Luke copied Mark, it seems to me unlikely that he should not retain Mark's words.

THE DEMONIAK'S PREVIOUS HISTORY

MARK v. 3-5.

*Ὅς τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἀλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς ἐδύνάτο αὐτὸν δῆσαι διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλάκις πέδαις καὶ ἀλύσει δεδῆσθαι καὶ διεσπᾶσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀλύσεις καὶ τὰς πέδας συνετριφθαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι· καὶ διὰ παντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἦν κράζων καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις.

MATT. viii. 28b.

Χαλεποὶ λίαν ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης.

LUKE viii. 27b, 29b.

Καὶ χρόνῳ ἱκανῶ οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν.

Πολλοὶς γὰρ χρόνος συνηρπάκει αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδεσμεύετο ἀλύσειν καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος, καὶ διαρῆσων τὰ δεσμὰ ἤλαύνετο ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους.

All this previous history is omitted by St Matthew; and the explanation seems clearly to be that St Matthew is using a different source from Mark. What we learn about the subject of the miracle is that he had been exasperated by the violent treatment which, as was usual among ourselves till almost our own day (as Hogarth's picture of Bedlam remains to testify), was pursued with those who were supposed to be out of their mind. They had tied him with cords, or fettered his feet, to prevent him going about; but his abnormal strength had burst the cords, and he had succeeded in rubbing away the fetters. Resenting these attempts to keep him in confinement, he shunned human society, living in the mountains and finding a nightly shelter in the tombs, of which, as we know from other stories, there were some containing chambers which could be used for human habitation. No wonder that his clothes were torn to pieces in his struggles to release himself; and we know from *King Lear* that in the time of our ancestors madmen were apt to be scantily dressed. Passers-by did not care to approach too closely to so dangerous a person; but they could hear his screams, and see him dealing mad blows against himself.

There is nothing in St Luke's account that he might not have learnt from Mark. He states indeed that the demoniak did not wear clothes, which St Mark does not mention in this place, but afterwards, when

relating the man's cure, he notes, as a token of his recovery, that he was clothed. St Luke, as we have just seen in the case of our Lord's going to sleep in the boat, is apt to correct deviations from chronological order in the manner in which his authority has told a story. The relations between Matthew and Mark are the reverse. St Matthew's short account is enlarged by St Mark, who has learnt something of the previous history of the subject of the miracle. The coincidence of the verb *ισχύειν* between Matt. verse 28 and Mark verse 4 would not by itself justify any inference; but if there were on other grounds reason to suppose that St Mark knew the shorter account, it would fall in with that supposition.

THE MEETING OF JESUS WITH THE DEMONIAK

MARK v. 6-10.

Καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτόν, καὶ κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγει, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; ὀρκίζω σε τὸν θεόν, μὴ με βασανίσῃς. ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ, Ἐξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, Τί ὀνομά σοι; καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Δεγιὼν ὀνομά μοι, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἐσμεν· καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἐξω τῆς χώρας.

MATT. viii. 29.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἡλθες ὥδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;

LUKE viii. 28, 29a, 30, 31.

Ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ [τοῦ θεοῦ] τοῦ ὑψίστου; δεομαί σου, μὴ με βασανίσῃς· παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Ἐπηρώτησεν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τί σοὶ ὀνομά ἐστιν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Δεγιὼν, ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν.

On inspection of these columns we are struck at once by the difference between the relations of Mark to Luke and to Matthew. And on looking more closely, it is seen that Luke agrees with Mark, not only in respect of the length at which the story is told, but in a multitude of details involving many verbal identities or close similarities. We have common the *κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*; the title of God, *τοῦ ὑψίστου*; the request, *μὴ με βασανίσῃς*; but above all, there is the very remarkable coincidence that in both there is the same deviation from the chronological order of telling the story,

viz., this request, *μή με βασανίσῃς*, is followed by the parenthetical explanation that Jesus had commanded the demon to come out; whereas the natural order would have been to tell first the command, and then the request elicited by the command. Note that what Matthew calls *the demon* is both in Mark and Luke *the unclean spirit*; and the little conversation, asking the demon's name and eliciting the answer, is common to Mark and Luke, but absent from Matthew. My own explanation of Mark's deviation from chronological order, to which I have just referred, is that St Mark, previous to writing his Gospel, was acquainted with the source used by St Matthew which told the story in the form in which Matthew presents it, ending with *βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς*, but St Mark, being able to give additional particulars, follows the order of the older narration as far as he can, and then makes his own addition. I do not suppose that St Matthew's account exactly represents the story as it was told in Q, which in my opinion only made mention of one demoniac, but I believe that Q's account omitted the particulars which are not found in Matthew.

THE DEMONS AND THE SWINE

MARK v. 11-13.

Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὄρει ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν. καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὥς δισχιλίοι, καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ.

MAT. viii. 30-32.

Ἦν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη. οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε. οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθαν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους· καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν.

LUKE viii. 32-33.

Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένη ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην καὶ ἀπεπνίγη.

The more I study the Gospels the more convinced I am that we have in them contemporaneous history; that is to say, that we have in them the stories told of Jesus immediately after His death, and which had been circulated, and, as I am disposed to believe, put

in writing while He was yet alive. There is much in this narrative which I consider must be accepted as historically true by any candid enquirer, whether he believes in the possibility of miracle or not. We have no reason to doubt that Jesus crossed the lake in a boat, that on the way He encountered a storm, that on the other side His fame as an exorcist had been justified and increased by the cure of a demoniac whom every one else had regarded as irretrievably mischievous. And the story which the Gospels tell of the circumstances of this cure, having no marks of being the results of a long growth of legend, may most reasonably be accepted as the very story which the disciples had to tell when they crossed the lake on their return.

If the story of demons entering into swine sounds now incredible in our ears, it must be remembered that those who find it so have also difficulty in believing that a demon could enter into a man; and so this latter possibility must be first discussed. Now I have treated the subject of demoniacs on the assumption that our experience of lunatics would enable us fully to understand the phenomena; and I dare say I am liable to be asked, whether I mean to say that what the Jews called a demoniac was no more than what we call a lunatic; and my answer is that I believe the difference lies altogether in the theories by which, in ancient and in modern times, his abnormal state was accounted for. In modern times we commonly content ourselves with a profession of ignorance. We believe that there is something wrong with the man's brain; but what exactly it is, and how it arose, ordinary people do not care much to enquire. The Jews believed that the cause of the disturbance was that some invisible being or beings had entered into possession of the man's body, and performed actions with it which he himself would not, or could not, have done. Naturally I cannot myself adopt a view so inconsistent with my training; but I must say that it is easier to reject such a theory than to refute it.

It would be outside the limits I have set myself if I

were to discuss the theological question, whether Jesus was in His human nature acquainted with modern astronomy, and whether it is permissible to believe that on other subjects He shared the erroneous beliefs of His countrymen ; in particular, whether He shared the then prevalent belief of His countrymen concerning demoniac possession. Certain it is that if that belief were erroneous He made no attempt to correct it ; and accordingly it is still held by His followers with regard to the phenomena which exhibited themselves in His day, though they give a different explanation of similar phenomena if they are exhibited in ours.

Returning now from this digression, I come back to what I was saying as to the complete credibility of the main facts of the story under discussion. It would appear that the fame of Jesus as an exorcist had reached the demoniac. Instead of assailing the stranger, as passers-by had learnt to think it likely that he would, he runs to meet Him, and falls at His feet in an attitude of supplication. The general belief had been that he was possessed by a demon ; he showed that belief himself and lived up to the character ; now he is equally persuaded that One has come who has authority to expel the demon.

It is universally agreed that what the Evangelists report as said by the demons, was said with the voice of the possessed man who spoke in their name. He proceeds then, in their name, to make conditions. They would depart if they were not sent out of the country ; might they not enter into the swine who were feeding there ? they could do so, for there were many of them. I believe that any prudent physician who had charge of the case would willingly accept these conditions. So many delusions have been cured by accepting the patient's own view of his case, and applying the remedy which he has himself suggested, that I see no reason for being shocked or surprised at being told that Jesus gave the desired permission. I do not think it makes much practical difference whether He did so, as St Matthew tells the story, in the form of a command *Go*, or as St Mark, and St Luke after him, softens it, in the form of

a simple permission. In any case it was justified by complete success. The man was completely satisfied that the demons had left him ; he became quite rational, and was willing to dress and comport himself like ordinary people. In all this I discover nothing incredible, or unworthy the character of Jesus.

A divergence of opinion need only arise when the question is raised, what exactly it was that occurred which convinced the man that the demons had left him, and had taken possession of the swine. All might agree that the animals had violently rushed off, and disappeared down the cliffs ; but commentators who try to explain why they did so will vary according to their theological prepossessions. No difficulty is felt by those who are content to accept the occurrence as supernatural, while those who will believe in nothing miraculous, if they are ashamed to put forward so improbable a solution as that of a chance coincidence, have nothing better to suggest than that it was the demoniac himself who hunted the animals away.

I doubt not that we have in Mark the story as the man himself told it, and as the disciples believed it ; and the only remaining question worth discussing is, whether they were competent witnesses. Now at the interview between the demoniac and our Lord the disciples were present, and were competent to report what took place. But after the demoniac had obtained permission to transfer his demons to the swine, it is to be supposed that he went to where these animals were feeding. Had he to go far? St Matthew says that they were *afar off*. It is true that the majority of the early Latin translators (*non longe*) seemed to have used a text which read οὐ μακρὰν, but the unanimous testimony of the Greek copies obliges us to regard the οὐ as an insertion, probably made to harmonise St Matthew's Gospel with that of St Mark, who says that the swine were *there on the mountain side* (*on the mountain*, Luke). *Mountain* is perhaps not the word we should have used to describe what is evidently meant, viz., high ground with steep banks overhanging the lake ; and Origen reports that

such high ground was to be found near the place which he calls Gergesa. We should conclude then that the swine were within sight of the disciples, but not very near them. They might have been able to see the swine rush away, but might be dependent on the man himself for his report of what had occurred ; we are therefore not in a position to refute the "minimisers," who treat miraculous stories in a manner with which I have no sympathy. In this instance they seem as if they had been appointed to scrutinise the bill sent in by the owners of the swine : "No doubt some swine were lost ; but were they as many as two thousand ?" The owners would of course be under a temptation to exaggerate the amount of the damage ; but that some serious loss had been incurred may be gathered from the desire of the local authorities that Jesus should leave the district. They evidently held Him responsible for the conduct of the demoniak, whom they recognised as being now under His control.

It is when we try to follow commentators into a discussion of the ethics of the transaction, such as I remember Huxley engaged in, in a magazine, that we find them guilty of what Archbishop Whately used to call the "thaumatrope fallacy." The question turns on whether Jesus was God, or at least One divinely endowed with supernatural power, or whether He was but an exceptionally gifted man, whose knowledge, however, was subject to the same limitations as ours. In the former case we have to own that the operations of Divine Power are above our criticism. We might as well bring an indictment against Providence for having permitted a Highland shepherd to lose a large number of lambs in a winter snowstorm, as on account of a number of swine that had been drowned in a Galilean lake. But if Jesus was but a man, why should Huxley find fault with a permission which no doubt he would have given himself, if he had been the demoniak's medical adviser. He could not have foreseen that the effects of the permission would have been so large. Even if He had, the permission had the effect of curing the afflicted person ; and we become entangled in the vivisectionist problem,

What amount of benefit to humanity would justify the sacrifice of those whom we count as inferior animals? There would be no dispute if only one had suffered. If the physician had prescribed that the man could be restored to health by a dinner of bacon, no one would have the smallest scruple about the killing of one pig. If it is the number that shocks us, we might ask, How many pigs are killed at Chicago in one quarter of an hour? It seems to be a matter of sentiment to consider a pig as not dying a natural death if he dies otherwise than by the butcher's knife. In any case, what I am insisting on is that it is not consistent to regard Jesus as not different from other men, when we are discussing what He did; and to assume Him to have been possessed of supernatural knowledge, when we are discussing whether what He did was justifiable.

THE CURE OF THE DEMONIAK: THE SEQUEL

MARK v. 14-20.

Καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς· καὶ ἦλθον ἰδεῖν τί ἐστιν τὸ γεγονός. καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ θεωροῦσιν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγῶνα, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν. Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾧ. καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σούς, καὶ ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ κύριός σοι πεποίηκεν καὶ ἡλῆσέν σε. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.

MATT. viii. 33-34.

Οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων. καὶ ἰδοὺ πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς ὑπάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως μεταβῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν.

LUKE viii. 34-39.

Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ γεγονός ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός καὶ ἦλθαν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ εὗραν καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς. καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασσηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι φόβος μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν. ἐδίδτο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ· ἀπέλυσεν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγων, Ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

This section exhibits in even a more marked manner close relationship between St Mark's account and St Luke's, while St Matthew's is much more brief, and seems quite independent of St Mark's. We are told that the swineherds were frightened, and ran away to the city. We should have expected them to run the other way, and try to stop the flight of the swine: but it was probably the formidable demoniak who frightened them. He would approach the herd in order to transfer to them his unwelcome inmates, as he had obtained permission to do. So to the city they ran, and the people there must have heard of the violence done to the swineherds before they heard of the cure of the demoniak. They would then come out full of anger against Jesus, who would have been described to them, if not as having done violence Himself, at least as abetting the man, who, under His instigation, had worked such mischief as he had never done before. And in this determination they persisted, after having seen the man restored to sanity.

St Matthew indeed does not mention that they witnessed the cure. Neither does St Matthew tell what St Mark and St Luke relate of the restored demoniak's request to our Lord to be allowed to join His company. It is needless to dwell on very obvious reasons why he was not deemed eligible for admission. Whatever good he could have done by bearing testimony to his own cure could only be effectually worked among those who had witnessed his frenzy; not among strangers who might see him in health, but could only learn by hearsay that he had not been always so.

One small change made by St Luke deserves to be remarked. According to St Mark, the restored demoniak is bidden to tell his friends *how great things the Lord had done for him*. St Luke certainly does not mean to change Mark's meaning when he alters this into *how great things God had done for him*. But by the time that St Luke wrote, the title *the Lord* had come especially to designate Jesus; and as the name seemed

unsuitable to be put into His own mouth, the less ambiguous *God* was substituted.

THE RETURN: JAIROS' DAUGHTER

MARK v. 21-24a.

Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολλὸς ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγωγῶν, ὀνόματι Ἰάειρος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ λέγων ὅτι, Τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ. καὶ ἀπήλθεν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

MATT. ix. 18, 19.

Ἰδοὺ ἀρχων [εἷς] προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων ὅτι, Ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν· ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρα σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται. καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοὺς ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

LUKE viii. 40-42a.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος, ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν. Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ὃ ὄνομα Ἰάειρος, καὶ οὗτος ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενὴς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἑτῶν δώδεκα καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκεν.

According to St Mark's account, which St Luke follows, the meeting with Jairus took place on our Lord's return from the other side of the lake where He had healed the demoniac. This is a point which an eye-witness could scarcely be mistaken about. The disciples could not avoid receiving some impression of failure at their Master's rejection by the Gerasenes; and it must have been cheering to them to find His influence and success undiminished when He returned to His former scene of work. I must recognise as an autoptic touch that we are told that when He came to land He found the people expecting and waiting for Him. They had seen on the previous day the boat carrying Him and His disciples away; when the boat was seen returning, the news soon spread, and there was a little crowd to welcome him back.

The order of St Matthew's arrangement I count as but of inferior authority, and as only an attempt to state consecutively anecdotes which he had been separately told in Church reading. St Matthew here

interpolates (ix. 1-17) three sections which St Mark had placed earlier, viz., the healing of the paralytic man in the synagogue, the calling of Matthew, and the question about fasting. I am disposed to believe that these three sections formed one day's reading in the Christian weekly assemblies, and that this is why we find them associated in all the Gospels. I believe that Q was originally a collection of the notes of such readings; and naturally the arrangement in order of different days' readings was liable to be disturbed. If the sections here interpolated are put back to an earlier place, St Matthew's order of the sections now under consideration becomes the same as St Mark's.

St Matthew in his narrative connects the application of Jairus with the question about fasting, telling that it was while Jesus was speaking that the ruler came up; but it is customary with St Matthew thus to connect anecdotes which he tells in immediate succession. The connexion in this case is deliberately made by the First Evangelist. The story consistently represents the ruler's application as made while our Lord was speaking, for when He accedes to it the word *ἐγερθεῖς* is used, expressing that our Lord now gets up from the sitting attitude of a Jewish teacher. St Matthew does not give the name of the ruler; we learn from St Mark, whom St Luke follows, that it was Jairus. St Matthew speaks of the man simply as a ruler; St Mark, followed by St Luke, tells that he was one of the rulers of the synagogue. St Luke, as his custom is, puts the facts into what he regarded as better order, and states at the beginning that the sick girl was twelve years old, a thing which St Mark tells only at the end. According to St Matthew, Jairus says that his daughter was dead, but according to St Mark's more circumstantial account, though his daughter had been supposed to be dying when Jairus was leaving home, the news that she was actually dead only reached him when Jesus was on His way to go to him.

THE WOMAN WITH THE ISSUE OF BLOOD

MARK v. 24b-34.

MATT. ix. 20-22.

LUKE viii. 42b-48.

In this section the close relation of Luke to Mark is very apparent. St Luke repeats St Mark's story only with such slight variations of language as would be made by any one who might be asked to repeat, as accurately as he could, a story which had been told by another. The only addition St Luke makes to the substance of what St Mark had told is that he names Peter as the utterer of the remonstrance against the apparent unreasonableness of the question, *Who touched me?* in such a crowd. It would be quite in character that he should be the speaker; and as he probably often told the story himself in the Church assembly, St Luke is likely to have had the best authority for the insertion of his name. St Mark however enlarges considerably the previous account given in Q by another of the disciples, which I regard as preserved by St Matthew. We should not have learnt from his Gospel how it became known that the woman had touched, and why. It is from Mark we learn that her confession was not quite voluntary, but was elicited by our Lord's own questionings.

I do not know whether it may not be refining too much to suggest that St Luke's ἀρνούμενων πάντων was meant to include the woman herself, and implies a use of Mark, who seems to relate that it was only when urged by our Lord that the woman now *told him all the truth*.

JAIRUS' DAUGHTER : THE SECOND MESSAGE

MARK v. 35-37.

Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι, Ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν· τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ, Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε. καὶ οὐκ ἀφήκεν οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου.

LUKE viii. 49-51.

Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχεται τις παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγων ὅτι, Τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου, μηκέτι σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ, Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευσον, καὶ σωθήσεται. ἔλθων δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οὐκ ἀφήκεν εἰσελθεῖν τινὰ σὺν αὐτῷ εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

St Matthew makes no mention of this second message. It was natural that one telling the story briefly should think it enough to mention that the girl had been supposed to be dead, while one who had an actual recollection of the occurrence should tell the facts just as they took place. In consequence of the silence of Q, which we may infer from that of St Matthew, St Luke has no other authority to follow than Mark, and the result is that the copying is so very close that a comparison yields scarcely any materials for comment. In one case a severe critic might think that St Luke, by compression, had somewhat injured the clearness of St Mark's narrative: St Mark reports that our Lord only permitted three of His disciples to accompany Him into the house, and that into the sick girl's chamber none were admitted but these three and the father and mother of the maiden. St Luke's compressed statement might seem to include the father and mother among the few then admitted *into the house*, in which no doubt they had been already. Mark puts John in a subordinate position, *John the brother of James*. St Luke's order here is, Peter, John and James (see also ix. 28, Acts i. 13). Luke wrote at a time when James was dead, and his fame had given place to that of his now better known brother.

JAIRUS' DAUGHTER : THE MIRACLE

MARK v. 38-43.

Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά, καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε; τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει, καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον· καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ, Ταλειθά κούμ, ὃ ἔστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον, Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει, ἣν γὰρ ἑτῶν δώδεκα. καὶ ἐξέστησαν εὐθὺς ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ. καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλά ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο, καὶ εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν.

MATT. ix. 23-26.

Καὶ ἔλθων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχοντος καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβούμενον ἔλεγεν, Ἄναχωρεῖτε, οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν τὸ κοράσιον ἀλλὰ καθεύδει· καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος, εἰσελθὼν ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἡγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκεῖνην.

LUKE viii. 52-56.

Ἐκλαίον δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Μὴ κλαίετε, οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει. καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ, εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν. αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν λέγων, Ἦ παῖς, ἔγειρε. καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρήμα, καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

On glancing at these three versions, we can at once perceive that St Luke has used Mark as his authority, but that St Matthew's account is quite independent; and it is probably the oldest of the three.

The most important difference between St Luke's account and St Mark's does not suggest that St Luke was making use of some other authority, but only that he understood in a different sense from that which our translators have usually given it the ambiguous word ἔγειρε, which occurs in St Mark's report of our Lord's command to the ruler's daughter. Taking St Mark's report by itself, we should put no other interpretation on it than that which translators generally have given it: our Lord took the maiden by the hand, saying *Damsel arise*; she did arise, and walked. But if we had no other account of the miracle but St Luke's, we should not think of translating ἔγειρε otherwise than

Awake. Jesus had said that she was not dead, but asleep; then He takes her by the hand, and ἐφώνησεν λέγων, words for which no weaker translation will suffice than *He loudly called with the words, etc.* At this loud call we are told, *her spirit returned*; and then St Mark's narrative is resumed: she got up immediately, and He prescribed that food should be given her. In other words, the getting up *and walking*, which has the first place in St Mark's account, has but a secondary place in St Luke's.

There are those who consider that they have the authority of our Lord Himself for expelling miracle from the story, and holding that the girl had never been really dead. St Luke certainly did not understand it so; for he clearly conveys that her spirit had really left her body, and undoubtedly this was the belief of our Lord's followers. At all events we cannot expel miracle from the story. How came Jesus, without having seen the girl, to be so positive that she was only asleep, in spite of the reiterated assurances of those who had been about her that she was really dead, and that it was ridiculous to think otherwise? It certainly looked like death when the αὐληταί, that is to say, the hired mourners and minstrels had been sent for. Apparently it was by these professional wailers that our Lord found the house thronged, and it may be assumed too that it was they who jeered at His announcement that their services were not required.

I do not doubt that St Mark used the account of Q, though I do not build much on the agreement of Matthew and Mark in the use of the word κοράσιον. The explanation of one point is not obvious: Why should our Lord give the injunction that the thing should not be made known? How could it be kept secret if it were a success at all? for crowds were assembled in the belief that the girl was dead. I suppose that the command was mainly directed to the three disciples who had been allowed to witness the miracle, and who were directed not to publish it at

once among their brethren ; and I suppose it would be enough for the parents of the child to inform their friends that it had turned out as the Master had said, that their daughter had been but asleep.

THE VISIT TO NAZARETH

MARK vi. 1-6a.

MATT. xiii. 53-58.

We have not a parallel in Luke to this section, common to Matthew and Mark, and very probably derived from Q. The reason of St Luke's omission no doubt is that he had already related our Lord's visit to Nazareth (iv. 16). I cannot doubt that it is the same visit that St Mark and St Luke are speaking of. The discourse which Luke records is so admirably adapted to the circumstances, if delivered after Jesus had been a few days in the little town, that St Luke must have founded his narrative on most trustworthy information. But on combining this justly valuable contribution with the information derived from other sources, I must pronounce St Luke to be inferior to St Mark in his chronological arrangement. We should imagine from St Luke's order of narration that the visit of which he tells took place in the very commencement of our Lord's ministry, and before He had gathered disciples as His companions. But according to St Mark's account, He had already enlisted disciples who accompanied Him on this visit. Moreover, St Luke's arrangement would also lead us to imagine that it was only after our Lord's repulse at Nazareth, that He went down to teach at Capernaum, though certainly St Matthew's Gospel would lead us to think that Capernaum was the first place in Galilee in which He settled after His return from the wilderness. And it appears from the story itself which we are considering that Jesus had already become known as a public

teacher and a worker of miracles, and that dissatisfaction was felt at Nazareth because He did not show any of the wonders there which they had heard of His having performed at Capernaum. Mark and Luke are in perfect agreement as to His non-performance of notable miracles at Nazareth, and as to the ill reception He met there. Every difficulty disappears when once we correct into conformity with Mark the ideas which St Luke's account, if we had no other, might have led us to form as to the chronological place of this incident in the history of our Lord's life. We have no reason to doubt the truth of the addition which St Luke makes to the story told by St Mark, viz., that Jesus was mobbed by the unfriendly populace on leaving the synagogue. The disciples whom He had brought with Him would be able to secure Him a safe passage through the crowd, but the reception He got would not make Him wish to visit the town again.

It is evident that in this section St Matthew is dependent, not on Q, but on Mark, whose language he copies with but slight alteration. The most important difference is that whereas in Mark, Jesus is called *the carpenter*, and *the son of Mary*, in Matthew He is *the carpenter's son*; and it is only said, *Is not his mother called Mary?* Clearly at the time of which St Mark wrote, Joseph was dead, and Jesus was working as a carpenter, and was known as *the son of Mary*. When St Matthew wrote, the idea that such work was degrading to our Lord suggested the transference of the handicraft to His father; and, moreover, it seemed strange to designate a man's parentage by His mother's name, instead of His father's. I must own that a different explanation may be given of this description of Jesus as *the son of Mary*. It was certainly unusual, as I have said, to designate a man's parentage by his mother's name; and St Luke in his account of the same visit represents (iv. 22) the people of Nazareth as saying, *Is not this Joseph's son?* and St John (vi. 42), though speaking of a different occasion, reports the

exclamation in the form, *Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?* It may be that it was St Mark who here varied from his original, through unwillingness to seem to recognise Joseph as the real father of our Lord.

The names of four of His brethren are given, and sisters are mentioned, who seem to have married and settled at Nazareth. I think it may be concluded that these brothers were sons of Joseph by a former wife. If they had been children of Mary, the story of her virginity could never have obtained currency in the Church in which the elder brothers of Jesus held high office; and the rise of this belief cannot be pushed down to a later time. On the other hand, that they were only cousins does not harmonise with the present incident. Jesus had apparently for some time left Nazareth; probably He had never returned to it since He had gone to John's baptism; He is now recognised as a native of the little town, and the recognition is confirmed by His relationship to four well-known citizens; but it seems to me that the relation of cousinship is too vague to be used in this way, and others besides these four might have had a right to claim it. I should conjecture that after the death of Joseph, Jesus had lived with His mother; His elder brothers being established elsewhere, and that He thus became known as *the son of Mary*.

When our Lord came back to Nazareth, He had evidently been so long out of it as to be no longer a familiar face in the town, and was recognised with some difficulty. Where had He been in the meantime? I suspect that He left Nazareth to receive baptism from John, and that His visit to the Baptist was not as transient as the Synoptic narrative might lead us to imagine. And I fancy that John's recognition of Him as his successor was founded on full knowledge of Him. Our Lord's transference of the scene of His activity to Capernaum may have resulted from His having made acquaintance in John's company with disciples from Capernaum, such as Andrew and Peter,

and perhaps the sons of Zebedee. Though I do not attach the same weight, as a contemporary record, to the Fourth Gospel as to the Synoptics, I believe that that Gospel has preserved for us some valuable traditions.

The saying that a prophet has no honour in his own country is included also by Luke (iv. 24) in his account of our Lord's sermon at Nazareth.

MARK vi. 4 ; MATT. xiii. 57.

Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι [αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ] καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

(Matt. om. words in brackets.)

LUKE iv. 24.

Οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.

St Luke is no such slavish copyist that his substitution of δεκτός for ἄτιμος should oblige us to suppose that he is drawing from a source different from Mark ; but since the whole story is independent of Mark, we need give no other account of the slight difference of forms in the report of this saying. We must, however, note that Mark, not Luke, has *among his own kin, and in his own house*. We cannot help connecting this with what the same Evangelist has told of the refusal of acknowledgment which Jesus met with from His own relatives. It is hard for an elder brother to accept a younger as his superior.

It is curious that John iv. 44 quotes this phrase as a saying of our Lord's, though it is not one that he has directly recorded himself, a proof, if any were needed, that St John was acquainted with other Gospels.

THE SENDING OUT OF THE APOSTLES

MARK vi. 6b.

Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων.

MATT. ix. 35a.

Καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας διδάσκων, κ.τ.λ.

It has been already said that St Mark places an interval between the first selection of the Twelve, and the sending them out to preach, while St Matthew makes no mention of that first selection. It is in this

place that St Mark records the sending out of the Apostles; and St Matthew seems to have made some use of his opening sentence in his own introduction to this part of the history. St Matthew however gives our Lord's charge to the departing Apostles, which St Mark has greatly abridged, and which I suppose to have been taken from Q. I do not suppose that St Matthew has textually reproduced Q; but his version is likely to be nearest to the original. St Luke has distributed this charge between instructions to the Twelve, and to the Seventy, whom he alone mentions.

MARK vi. 7.

Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο, καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων.

12, 13.

Καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοώσιν, καὶ δαίμονια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλλον, καὶ ἤλειπον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους καὶ θεράπευον.

MATT. x. 1.

Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

LUKE ix. 1, 2.

Συνκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι.

St Mark had previously stated (iii. 15) that our Lord's intention in choosing the Twelve was *that He might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out demons*. Here he only mentions the actual conferring of the authority over demons, and does not think it necessary to repeat the instruction to preach, though their actually doing so, as well as their casting out of demons, is recorded (vv. 12, 13). The oldest MSS. of Mark iii. 15 say nothing about the Apostles' healing diseases; but their doing so by anointing with oil is here mentioned (verse 13). It may be questioned whether the reading which obtained the widest circulation is not the right one. Luke has the νόσους θεραπεύειν, and healing is made part of their function.

MATT. x. 5b, 6.

Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε· πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.

This limitation of the field of the Apostles' original labours is not recorded by the other Evangelists, in whose time the Gospel had received a wider extension. The phrase *the lost sheep of the house of Israel* comes from Q, where it occurs again in the story of the Syro-Phœnician woman, whence it was derived by St Matthew, xv. 24, where our Lord when speaking of His own mission says, οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.

MATT. x. 7.

Πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε λέγοντες ὅτι, Ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

LUKE ix. 2. κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

„ „ 6. εὐαγγελιζόμενοι.

„ x. 9. λέγετε αὐτοῖς, Ἡγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

„ „ 11. τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

This announcement is that with which our Lord's own preaching commenced (Mark i. 15; Matt. iv. 17). As St Matthew has reported our Lord's words, they might be understood merely as a general announcement of the approaching foundation of the Messiah's kingdom; but St Luke gives them a particular application. To those who gladly received the Gospel invitation it was announced that the Kingdom of God had come to them; and those who repelled the message were equally warned that the Kingdom of God had come to them, though they had rejected a part in it. The subject of the Apostles' preaching is given by Mark vi. 12, ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν.

MARK vi. 8, 9.

Καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἰρῶσιν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ ράβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν, ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι δύο χιτῶνας.

MATT. x. 8, 9, 10.

Ἀσθενούντας θεραπεύετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε· δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε. Μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, μὴ πήραν εἰς ὁδὸν μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας μηδὲ ὑποδήματα μηδὲ ράβδον· ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ.

LUKE ix. 3.

Μηδὲν αἰρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, μήτε ράβδον μήτε πήραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀργύριον, μήτε δύο χιτῶνας ἔχετε.

LUKE x. 4a.

Μὴ βαστάετε βαλλάντιον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ ὑποδήματα.

St Matthew's introduction here, bestowing on the envoys miraculous powers, is peculiar to himself, and does not seem to have been taken from the common source. We read with some surprise that they were commissioned, not merely to cleanse lepers, but to raise the dead, a miracle which we do not read of any of the Apostles having performed during our Lord's lifetime. We can well believe however in the originality of the instruction that they were not to take money for cures, the power to perform which they had obtained gratuitously.

Jesus was not sending His disciples on a long journey; and so they were to go lightly clad, and were to trust to the hospitality they might meet with, without making provision of their own. They were not to wear heavy shoes¹ nor a double shirt. According to Mark, they might carry a stick; but this permission is refused by the earlier authority. If it meant a stick for the purposes of defence, we could understand the prohibition; but a walking stick seems innocent. They were not to carry provisions when they started, nor in going from one house to another; so a wallet was not required, nor permitted. And as they were to pay no money, they were to take no money with them; as we should say, *Neither gold, nor silver, nor even a copper.*

MARK vi. 10-11.

Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς; Οπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἐκεῖ μένετε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε ἐκεῖθεν. καὶ ὅς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκείθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

MATT. x. 11-14.

Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀξίος ἐστίν· κακεῖ μένατε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν· καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ᾗ ἡ οἰκία ἀξία, ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐτήν· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ᾗ ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω. καὶ ὅς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κορπὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

LUKE ix. 4, 5.

Καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐκεῖ μένετε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε. καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης τὸν κοριοτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς.

¹ See note on p. 53.

In this place St Luke seems to have been dependent wholly on Mark for the portion of our Lord's address which he gives here. But we must subjoin his much fuller representation, which he gives as a charge to the Seventy.

LUKE X. 5-11A.

Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν εἰσέλθῃτε οἰκίαν πρῶτον λέγετε, Εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ. καὶ ἐὰν ἐκεῖ ᾖ υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐπαναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀνακάμψει. ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἐσθοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν, ἅγιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. μὴ μεταβαίνειτε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν. καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν, καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς, καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς, Ἦγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν εἰσέλθῃτε καὶ μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς εἴπατε, Καὶ τὸν κοριορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν.

I believe the key to the explanation of the small variations in these accounts is that St Mark's imperfect tenses, and his aorist ἤρξατο forbid us to think that the sending out of the Twelve was performed by a single definite act; each couple sent out on its special mission received its own charge. And what forbids us to believe that in the course of our Lord's ministry, as to the exact duration of which we have no definite information, He may have employed others beside the Twelve in similar preaching tours? St Luke must have met many who had been personally acquainted with our Lord, and whose names have not come down to us. One of those who, though not of the Twelve, had been thus sent by our Lord, might have truly reported the charge given him when he was sent forth. In the charge given to each of these missionaries, whether their number was exactly seventy or not, the original charge might have been slightly modified by subsequent practice.

Returning now to the charge to the Seventy as reported by St Luke, I cannot but think that Q has been used for the opening sentences. He begins (x. 2) with the identical words with which St Matthew has prefaced his account of the appointment of the Twelve

(ix. 37, 38), the direction to the disciples to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into the harvest.

Then follows (Luke x. 3) ὑπάγετε ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. We are here struck by the ὑπάγετε, a word which St Luke generally avoids, and which, strange to say, does not occur in the parallel passage of Matthew (ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα, κ.τ.λ. x. 16); still I believe it to have come from Q, since we find the ἰδοὺ both in Luke and Matthew. The rest of that section in Matthew has strong affinities with our Lord's warnings, Matt. xxiii., xxiv., and its tenor seems to harmonise best with that later period of our Lord's ministry. But it should be noted that Matt. x. 40 has a parallel in Luke x. 16.

The directions (Luke x. 4) about taking no money are the same as those given in Matthew; but St Luke's addition, *Salute no man by the way*, requires some comment. We must take it in connexion with the charge in Matthew, *As ye enter into the house, salute it*; and it is plain from Matthew's words that Luke correctly gives the form of salutation, *Peace be to this house*. Matthew and Luke agree that the disciples were not to distress themselves with doubts whether he on whom the benediction was bestowed were worthy of it. If he were *a son of peace* it would rest on him; if not, their peace would return to them again. But this solemn benediction was not to be vulgarised by universal application. It was not to be given to the chance passers-by whom they met on the road.

Luke x. 7.—This is the same direction as that given Matt. x. 11. The envoys were not to leave the house in which they had been first received, even though better accommodation might be offered them afterwards, or by a more distinguished person. But according to Matthew they were not to make their first choice without enquiry as to the worthiness of him who proposed to receive them.

Luke x. 8.—The phrase *Eat whatsoever is set before you* is used by St Paul (1 Cor. x. 27) though with a

somewhat different application. In this passage, the missionaries are directed not to quarrel with the food which their hosts provided for them, even though it might be coarse or poor. St Paul has chiefly in view the case where the food might be such as, if its history were enquired into, they might have a religious scruple in using. So again, the maxim *The labourer is worthy of his hire*, which has a parallel, though not in absolutely verbal agreement, in Matt. x. 10, is found in 1 Tim. v. 18 in a form exactly the same as St Luke's. My belief is that the reading of the Gospel history was even then part of the service at the weekly Christian meetings; and it would not be strange if St Paul used words which he had heard, possibly even from St Luke's own lips, if it were he to whom this evangelistic work was entrusted.

MATT. x. 15.

Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται
γῇ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
κρίσεως ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

LUKE x. 12.

Λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἢ τῇ πόλει
ἐκείνῃ.

This sentence is omitted by St Mark, and by St Luke where he copies Mark, but is added in this second passage, where he gives this charge to the Seventy, and where we may believe he is using Q as his authority.

The passage which next follows in Luke appears in a different connexion in Matthew, xi. 21, and seems to have been only placed here by St Luke because it presents a kindred idea to that of his twelfth verse; namely that of the greater responsibility attached to the being granted higher privileges; but as it occurs also in Matthew we may regard it as derived from Q, and this is not an inconvenient place for considering it.

THE REPROACHES

MATT. xi. 20-24.

Τότε ἤρξατο ὀνειδίζειν τὰς πόλεις ἐν αἷς ἐγένοντο αἱ πλεῖσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐ μετενόησαν· Οὐαί σοι, Χοραζεῖν· οὐαί σοι, Βηθσαιδάν· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ μετενόησαν. πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ ὑμῖν. Καὶ σύ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; ἕως ᾧδου καταβήσῃ. ὅτι εἰ ἐν Σοδόμοις ἐγενήθησαν αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν σοί, ἔμεινεν ἂν μέχρι τῆς σήμερον. πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι γῇ Σοδόμων ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ σοί.

LUKE x. 13-15.

Οὐαί σοι, Χοραζεῖν· οὐαί σοι, Βηθσαιδάν· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγενήθησαν αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ καθήμενοι μετενόησαν. πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἢ ὑμῖν. Καὶ σύ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; ἕως τοῦ ᾧδου καταβήσῃ.

The only information we have about Chorazin is the statement of Jerome that it was only two miles from Capernaum.¹ We do not read of it elsewhere in the Bible; and it is natural to think that our Lord's work there must have preceded the call of Peter, with which our Gospel account of the preaching of Jesus begins. In that case our Lord may have visited it when Capernaum was His centre of work, and have there performed some notable miracles; but I think the details of these miracles would have been preserved for us if their date had fallen within the period with which our Gospel history deals. Of Bethsaida we shall have to speak again.

OUR LORD'S THANKSGIVING

MATT. xi. 25-27.

Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναί, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου. Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐξ ἀνάγκης· ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

LUKE x. 21, 22.

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ᾠρᾷ ἡγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν, Ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναί, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου. Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐξ ἀνάγκης· ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

¹ "Est autem nunc desertum in secundo lapide a Capharnaum." *Liber de situ et nominibus*.

The identity of St Luke's account with St Matthew's shows that both Evangelists are drawing from the same source ; and I cannot doubt that it is the same source, Q, as that from which so much of the preceding is taken. I have therefore not been willing to separate this thanksgiving of our Lord from the woes which it immediately follows in Matthew ; otherwise St Luke's arrangement has much to recommend it. He makes it immediately follow the return of the missionaries who had been sent out, and who reported the cures and exorcisms which they had successfully performed. After this, our Lord's exulting declaration of His commission succeeds most naturally. We can conceive that at Chorazin and at Bethsaida dwelt some of those in authority, revered for their wisdom, who had opposed our Lord's preaching, and had for a time seemed to be successful. After the woes on the authors of this rejection, might naturally follow thanksgivings for the victory won in spite of it. I frankly own, however, that we are on uncertain ground when we try to arrange in chronological order sayings which in Q may have been unconnected. If we had to depend on our own conjectures, probably we might have placed these thanksgivings at the time when, under the lead of Peter, the disciples were brought to join in an acknowledgment of our Lord's Messiahship.

But perhaps some comment is necessary on St Luke's phrase that on this occasion Jesus *rejoiced in the Holy Spirit*, for ἡγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ is the reading which is attested by a strong array of the oldest MSS., including some which in other places are not in agreement with B^x (B^x D *ins.* ἐν ; B *om.* ἐν). I add to these a few which have ἐν τῷ πνεύματι without τῷ ἁγίῳ, instead of simply τῷ πνεύματι, the reading followed by the translators of the A. V. (so A.). When once the ἐν was introduced, no one could then understand the Spirit in which our Lord spoke to be anything but the Holy Spirit. The conception seems to be especially Lucan ; for St Luke gives especial prominence to what we should call the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit, which

according to his view put the especial difference between the baptisms of Jesus and of John. In the history of the Acts great importance is given to the action of the prophets who were in St Paul's company, and who claimed authority to say *Thus saith the Holy Ghost*. St Paul writing to the Corinthian Church, says (1 Cor. xiv. 26) *Each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation*. He who gave utterance to such sayings under the influence of the Holy Spirit, was said to *speak in the Spirit*. Now on Jesus was poured at His baptism the Spirit without measure; and St Luke, who in his phrase *Jesus was led by the Spirit in the wilderness*, seems to distinguish what our Lord did under the impulse of the Spirit from the working of His human personality, seems to identify this saying of our Lord's as of like character with things spoken by the N. T. prophets *in the Spirit*. The same idea seems to me to underlie the statement (Acts xvi. 7) that it was the *Spirit of Jesus* which forbade Paul and his company to visit Bithynia; by which I understand that it was the same Spirit who dwelt in Jesus when He was on earth.

In Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22 we have a coincidence which can only be explained by a common use of Q, and it is certainly remarkable that in this, the oldest Christian document of which we have any trace, there should be put into the mouth of our Lord Himself as high a claim for His dignity and His powers as any at which critics have taken umbrage in the report of the Fourth Evangelist. The connexion with what precedes seems to be that if we ask how it is that some should be able to see what others of greater natural powers and higher education are blind to, all must be referred to the good pleasure of God. It is not by natural powers, but by a special revelation, that men can be made to know either Father or Son. The Father, who has committed all things to the Son, has empowered Him to make revelations to whom He will.

There follow here words in Luke which, being

found also in Matthew, may probably be referred to Q as their original; but we have no means of ascertaining the occasion on which they were spoken. Both in Matthew and in Luke they are quite in harmony with their context, but the contexts in the two cases are quite different.

MATT. xiii. 16, 17.

Ἰμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὥτα [ὑμῶν] ὅτι ἀκούουσιν. ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

LUKE x. 23, 24.

Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν, Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

THE EXTENSION OF OUR LORD'S FAME TO HEROD'S COURT

MARK vi. 14-18.

Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερόν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἥλεις ἐστίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι προφήτης ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἔλεγεν, Ὁν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἠγέρθη. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν· ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ ὅτι, Οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

MATT. xiv. 1-4.

Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὴν ἀκοὴν Ἰησοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ, Οὗτος ἐστὶν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ. Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάννην ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ ἀπέθετο διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης αὐτῷ, Οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἔχειν αὐτήν.

LUKE ix. 7-9.

Ἦκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα, καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ὑπὸ τινῶν δὲ ὅτι Ἥλεις ἐφάνη, ἄλλων δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. εἶπεν δὲ [ὁ] Ἡρώδης, Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα· τίς δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; καὶ ἐξήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν.

In this section I feel no doubt that St Luke has derived his account from Mark, the verbal differences being only such as St Luke commonly introduces in

his copying. But I am inclined to think that the story was told in Q, and that this version of it was employed by St Mark as well as by St Matthew. These two Evangelists have in common the explanation given of the miracles of Jesus, αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργούσιν ἐν αὐτῷ. What makes me think it likely that St Matthew got this phrase from Q, rather than from Mark, is that only six verses earlier (xiii. 54), where St Matthew is certainly using Q, he reports the question raised in the synagogue of Nazareth, πόθεν τοῦτω ἡ σοφία αὕτη καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις. That the other two Evangelists used Mark is, however, evident from their both having followed St Mark in his arrangement of the narrative. There is no direct account of the imprisonment and death of John. But we are told that when Jesus grew into notoriety, Herod heard of Him, and was disposed to adopt one current theory about Him, viz., that He was John whom Herod had beheaded, and who had now risen from the dead. St Mark, who had not mentioned the Baptist since relating how he had baptized our Lord, now goes back on his history; and in order to explain the saying *John, whom I beheaded*, here relates the imprisonment and death of John. It is incredible that two historians should by independent chance agree in such a violation of orderly narration; and one who has compared other sections common to Matthew and Mark cannot doubt on which side the obligation lies.

In this case, however, we have to ask ourselves whether St Matthew has not made a mistake in his following of Mark. He agrees with that Evangelist, in telling next after the story of John's death that of the retirement of Jesus and His disciples to a desert place where He feeds the multitude. But St Matthew makes this retirement consequent on the return of the Apostles from the preaching tour on which their Master had sent them. He represents the retirement as caused by the fact that the news of John's death had just then reached Jesus. St Matthew assumes that the narrative on which he was depending was told in chronological

order; in which case the Baptist's death must have occurred between the sending out of the Apostles and their return. But we should rather gather from St Mark's narrative that the Baptist's death had occurred some time previously, and is only related here by St Mark in order to explain the saying, *This is John, whom I beheaded.*

If St Matthew has here made a mistake, St Luke has avoided it. He follows Mark's order, and connects the retirement to a desert place only with the return of the Apostles from their tour. Though St Luke does not here relate the death of John, his close verbal agreement with Mark proves his dependence on him. But we find in a couple of other instances St Luke correcting the order in which his predecessors had told their story, and putting into what he regarded as the proper place an incident which they had told, but not placed quite so early as in his judgment it ought to have been related. In this case, we know from Matt. xi. 2 that at least John's imprisonment, of which St Mark tells here for the first time, had occurred before the fame had reached the Baptist that Jesus was performing Messianic acts. St Luke's sense of chronological propriety taught him that, if the casting of John into prison were to be told at all, it ought to be told earlier; and accordingly he relates it (iii. 19, 20), but with the omission of details, which, though a necessary part of a full biography of John, were not equally relevant to a biography of Jesus. And he does not think it necessary in this place to interrupt his narrative, in order to record the well-known fact that the Baptist's imprisonment, of which he had told before, had ended in his death.

In the account of the different opinions current about Jesus, St Luke follows Mark so closely that it is not worth while to comment on trifling variations; but we must note how St Luke, in anticipation of a story which he will afterwards have to tell, but which seems to have been unknown to St Mark, mentions in this place Herod's desire to see Jesus.

It is also to be noted that St Mark calls this Herod *the king*; it is very conceivable that the title, *Herod the king*, which his predecessor had borne, remained for some time not only in courtly, but in popular, use. St Luke who shows (iii. 1), that he had given some attention to the political history of the time, corrects Mark's impropriety of language and calls him *the tetrarch*, and this more correct designation was in use when St Matthew's Gospel was compiled. But in verse 9 St Matthew slips back into the use of the title *King*, which I take as an indication that he is following Mark.

Mark retains some ancient forms of expression. Thus John is not known by the name of *the Baptist*, which ultimately came to be the accepted form in the Christian Church, but is always called *the Baptizer*.

Mark vi. 17-18 are practically identical with Matt. xiv. 3, 4.

MARK vi. 19, 20.

Ἡ δὲ Ἡρῳδιάς ἐνείχεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν, καὶ οὐκ ἤδυνατο· ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβείτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἁγίον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν.

MATT. xiv. 5.

Καὶ θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

Here St Matthew forsakes Mark's guidance, and adopts another current account, which may have been that of Q, but which we have no reason to regard as more worthy of credit. According to Matthew, Herod had all along been desirous to put John to death, and had only refrained from doing so through fear of shocking the populace, who venerated John as a prophet. As far as danger from the populace was concerned (and Herod does not seem to have on other occasions scrupled to shock the popular sentiments) the state of things was the same after the dance as before. According to Mark, it was Herodias who was desirous to have the Baptist put to death, but had not been able to obtain the consent of her husband, who had respect and regard for John.

The *πολλὰ ἡπόρει* of the oldest MSS., though by no means free from obscurity, is, I think, to be preferred to the *πολλὰ ἐποίει* of the later. If it was in the text that St Luke read, it might account for the *διηπόρει* in Luke ix. 7.

MARK vi. 21.

Καὶ γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαιρου ὅτε Ἑρῳδῆς τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίησεν τοῖς μεγιστάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Ταλαίας,

MATT. xiv. 6a.

Γενεσίοις δὲ γενομένοις τοῦ Ἑρῳδοῦ

St Mark's fuller account of the number and dignity of the assembled guests harmonises with his statement of Herod's unwillingness to put John to death. The more public and solemn his promise to the girl, the more difficult to refuse to fulfil it.

MARK vi. 22, 23.

Καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς [αὐτῆς τῆς] Ἑρῳδιάδος καὶ ὀρχησαμένης, ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἑρῳδῇ, καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τῷ κορασίῳ, Αἴτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι· καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ, Ὅτι ἐὰν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι ἕως ἡμέρας τῆς βασιλείας μου.

MATT. xiv. 6b, 7.

Ὁρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἑρῳδιάδος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ καὶ ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἑρῳδῇ, ὅθεν μετὰ ὅρκου ὠμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃται.

I think it best to begin by noticing the awkwardness of expression in Mark, because it bears on the question whether St Matthew was able to use for this story a source different from Mark, and earlier. St Matthew's own account is perfectly plain and intelligible; but St Mark's, if literally translated, runs, *When the daughter of Herodias came in and danced, pleased Herod*, which leaves it ambiguous who or what pleased Herod; and the translators of the R. V. give as an alternative rendering, *It pleased*; but I reject all criticisms of the Gospel text, or explanations of it, which ignore the Synoptic problem. In this case the words *ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἑρῳδῇ*, common to Matthew and Mark, must in both be interpreted in the same way: that is to say, we must render, *She pleased Herod*. It might be supposed that the awkward construction must have

been the original, and the smoother a later improvement. But, on the other hand, if Q had been the original, we must suppose this to have been of Semitic origin; and to a Jewish writer the construction with the indicative is more natural and intelligible than the use of participles. St Mark, however, was so familiar with this use that he has packed seven participles into one sentence (vv. 25-27); and in the present instance, if he has offended against the laws of grammatical purists, he has sinned in the company of some good writers. There is therefore no difficulty in holding that St Matthew has reproduced the form of Q, which St Mark has altered in telling the story his own way.

But we come now to a point which puts a crucial test on our adherence to the oldest MSS. In Mark vi. 22 instead of ἀντὶς τῆς, B and S, supported by such evidence as in other cases has been thought sufficient to induce us to accept their verdict (in this case, DLΔ, but no version), read ἀντοῦ: that is to say, the girl who danced was not merely the daughter of Herodias, but was Herod's own daughter, and her name was Herodias. I have already said that our investigation into the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels has an important bearing on questions of reading, and in this case I count it a strong objection to the reading ἀντοῦ that St Matthew has not adopted it.

The manuscript evidence proves that ἀντοῦ was the reading of a manuscript older than either Vatican or Sinaitic, which therefore must have been one of very great antiquity. But was the transcriber of that ancient MS. incapable of making a mistake? and if he did make a blunder, have we a right to charge the blunder on St Mark? I count it established that St Matthew used St Mark's Gospel; and the question arises, Did St Matthew find the reading ἀντοῦ in his copy of Mark? Either he did not, or he deliberately rejected it as an error. We do not consider ourselves bound to follow the original reading of a manuscript, if there be a correction *prima manu*. On similar

grounds, a reading rejected at so early a date as that at which St Matthew wrote must be condemned as faulty. But if I am right in thinking that St Matthew not only used Mark, but also a still older authority which described the dancer as only the daughter of Herodias, the difficulty is increased when we are asked to believe that St Mark of his own accord introduced a statement for which a previous document with which he was acquainted gave him no authority.

That St Mark should introduce such a statement is directly contrary to the whole spirit of his account, which is directed to diminishing as far as possible the guilt of Herod. St Mark is careful to tell that the dancer had pleased not only Herod, but all the guests, whose sympathy he must have had in promising a reward to the successful performer, and with whom he would incur discredit by breaking his word. But a failure of promise would only be a disgrace if it had been made to one who was independent of him. If the girl were his own daughter, the whole thing would be a private matter between him and her. I therefore see no reason that St Mark could have had for departing from the earlier version of the story.

I own that the reading *ἀπὸ τῆς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος* is a strange and awkward form of expression; so much so that a few authorities which have followed the reading have cut down the *ἀπὸ τῆς τῆς* into *τῆς*. But the argument cuts both ways: the harsher the form of expression, the more likely that a transcriber or editor would change it. It is possible that St Mark might have first written *her daughter*, and then added *Herodias's* to avoid ambiguity, so that *τῆς Ἡρῆς διάδος* might have been a marginal explanation that found its way into the text. Again, if following some Latin versions we translate, *ipsius Herodiadis*, Herodias's own daughter, not merely step-daughter, the clause would express some surprise that the Queen should permit her daughter to make such an exhibition of herself. But certainly we should feel even greater surprise if it was her own father who

had produced the spectacle. I do not know enough of the feelings of Eastern potentates to pronounce it incredible that Herod should have tolerated such an exhibition; but if he did, manners must have changed greatly since Queen Vashti's time. I may add that the book of Esther must have been well known at the time; for the words of the promise, *unto the half of my kingdom* were plainly suggested by that book. Further, if this girl was a daughter of Herod's, John must have been very tardy in his remonstrances, if he did not rebuke Herod until the connection had lasted so long that a daughter of the marriage had grown up, and was old enough to play the part here ascribed to her. Even allowing for Eastern precocity we cannot put her age at much less than twelve. Either John was demanding the dissolution of a marriage which had lasted some thirteen years, or if his remonstrance was earlier, Herodias must have bottled up her wrath very long. I have tried whether we might not remove the last objection to accepting the reading of B, by reducing still more the age of the girl. Suppose she were but a pretty child, whose dancing the father admired so much that in paternal pride he exhibited her performance to his guests, we can then understand how when she was empowered to ask for a recompense she should run off to her mother to get instructions what to ask for. If this were so, we must press very lightly on the clause *she gave it to her mother*, which, if literally understood, would make the child the bearer of the ghastly burden. On the whole, considering how very local the evidence for *αὐτοῦ* is, and how early that reading was rejected, I am less inclined to throw on St Mark the responsibility of what seems to be an error than to attribute it to the chance blunder of an early transcriber.

MARK vi. 24-29.

Καὶ ἐξελθοῦσα εἶπεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς, Τί αἰτήσωμαι; ἡ δὲ εἶπεν, τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτίζοντος. καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ᾗτήσατο λέγουσα, Θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῷς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. καὶ περὶ λυπὸς γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τοὺς ὅρκους καὶ τοὺς ἀνακειμένους οὐκ ᾔθέλησεν ἀθετῆσαι αὐτήν· καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτορα ἐπέταξεν ἐνεγκαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπεκεφάλισεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ ἤνεγκεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ, καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦλθαν καὶ ἦραν τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ἐν μνημείῳ.

MATT. xiv. 8-12.

Ἡ δὲ προβιβασθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς, Δός μοι, φησὶν, ὥδε ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. καὶ λυπηθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τοὺς ὅρκους καὶ τοὺς συνανακειμένους ἐκέλευσεν δοθῆναι, καὶ πέμψας ἀπεκεφάλισεν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ· καὶ ἠνέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι καὶ ἐδόθη τῷ κορασίῳ, καὶ ἤνεγκεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦραν τὸ πτῶμα καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

We may notice in this comparison St Mark's preference for the dramatic over the historical form of narration. St Matthew's dependence on Mark is very striking. We have a double illustration of it in verse 9: viz., the use of Mark's word βασιλεὺς, and the description of Herod as λυπηθεὶς, which falls in with St Mark's account, but is quite opposed to St Matthew's, according to which Herod ought rather to have been glad of the good occasion to accomplish a long desired purpose.

It remains to notice one other point, which, though it does not affect the sense, is a little perplexing to those who read Mark with a microscope, as we have been attempting to do. It has been already remarked that according to the oldest text, St Mark always speaks of John as *the Baptist*, and in this story that word is used, and the instruction given by the mother to the daughter is that she should ask for the head of *John the Baptist*. But St Mark, who reports with Homeric fulness, but not with Homeric fidelity, not only the message, but the actual delivery of the message, makes the daughter say *Give me at once the head of John the Baptist*. We had a somewhat parallel case in St Luke's report of the delivery of the message given by the Baptist to his two disciples. I can only account for the variation here by

the supposition that when St Mark wrote, *Baptist* had already become the form in ordinary use, and that although he strove to retain an older form, yet he slides back inadvertently into the more ordinary phrase.

THE RETURN OF THE MISSIONARIES

MARK vi. 30.

Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν.

LUKE ix. 10a.

Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐποίησαν.

This is the only place where St Mark himself uses the title *ἀπόστολοι*, which he has stated that our Lord gave the Twelve; and in this place the word seems to have no other meaning but the etymological one, *missionaries* or *envoys*. St Luke merely follows Mark here, and like him, does not record any discourse spoken by our Lord on their return. But in telling of the return of the Seventy, St Luke (x. 17) records something of what passed, which he probably learnt from the same disciple of our Lord on whose authority he related the appointment of these later missionaries. Having been sent out in pairs, on different errands, it is not likely that they came back simultaneously; but we owe to St Luke what may be regarded as a report of the reception of at least one couple. They came back with joy, saying *Lord, even the devils are subject unto us in thy name*. According to St Luke's account of the commission given to the Seventy, they were empowered to heal the sick; but nothing is said about the casting out of demons. It was then a pleasant surprise for them that when they attempted to exorcise, they were successful.

THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

It has been already remarked that the use of two authorities is apt to give rise to "doublets," the editor

being in danger of taking for two events what is really the description of the same event by different authorities. This miracle of feeding the five thousand is told by all four Evangelists, and is the only story of the kind told by St Luke and St John. St Matthew and St Mark have to tell of a second feeding of a multitude, the two accounts being so like each other in their circumstances that a suspicion has been entertained that the two are but descriptions of the same event, coming from different sources. If it had been St Matthew only who gave the double account we should have an easy explanation, viz., that he had incorporated two accounts, one derived from Q, and the other from Mark; but it was from Mark that St Matthew derived the double narration; and there can be no doubt of St Mark's belief that this form of miracle had been repeated on a second occasion. It will be time enough to discuss this matter when the second miracle comes under consideration. At present, what chiefly demands consideration is whether we can trace the use of a source other than Mark in the accounts given by the other Synoptics.

MARK vi. 31, 32.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον. ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν. καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.

MATT. xiv. 13a.

Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.

LUKE ix. 10b.

Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόντον καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά.

We cannot doubt of St Matthew's use of Mark when we find such a phrase reproduced as εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν. Luke also has the κατ' ἰδίαν. St Matthew, as we have seen, attributes the retirement of our Lord to apprehension caused by the tidings of the Baptist's death; St Mark gives no other reason for this retirement than the incessant thronging of crowds who came, whether to receive instruction, or hoping for a miraculous cure. It is true that in St Mark's Gospel the account of this retirement immediately follows that of the Baptist's

death; but this death is related in a little digression, and does not seem intended to have any connexion with the narrative immediately following.

I imagined at first that St Luke had got hold of a different authority, when he mentioned Bethsaida, which is not found here in Mark. But this is only an instance of St Luke's looking ahead, and stating at once what his authority states later (see Mark vi. 45). The town best known under the name of Bethsaida was on the east side of the lake, and at some distance from it. In the present case, the story seems to require that the place here described should be somewhere on the west side of the lake. Confirmatory evidence that there was such a place there is little, either in ancient or modern times. But it is possible that there may have been a Bethsaida as well as a Chorazin situated not very far from Capernaum, whose rulers, though we hear little of them in the Gospel history, may have played an important part in the early rejection of our Lord.

MARK vi. 33, 34.

Καὶ εἶδαν αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοὶ, καὶ περὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς. Καὶ ἐξεληθὼν εἶδεν πολλὸν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.

MATT. xiv. 13b, 14.

Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ περὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων. Καὶ ἐξεληθὼν εἶδεν πολλὸν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν.

LUKE ix. 11.

Οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γινόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο.

In this passage the language of Matthew is so completely framed on that of Mark that we have no reason to think that he is using any other source. St Mark's phrase, *He saw them . . . as sheep not having a shepherd*, is suggested by a passage in Q, used already by St Matthew, ix. 36. In that passage, however, Matthew seems to refer to the people's need of healing; in this place rather to their need of instruction.

There is nothing surprising in the statement that the people that went by land arrived before those that went by boat; so that when our Lord landed He

found them ready to welcome Him, and receive His instruction. We must remember what kind of a boat it is likely to have been. It was one made to hold a large quantity of nets, and a sufficient crew to work them; on this occasion it held twelve Apostles besides our Lord. This was no racing gig, but a great clumsy craft, whose progress must have been slow.

St Luke agrees with St Matthew in saying that our Lord healed those that had need of healing, a thing not mentioned by St Mark. So far, this is the only indication that the other two Evangelists used a source other than Mark, and this indication is far from being decisive.

We may infer that this was not the first time that our Lord had taught in the same spot. When the people on the shore of the lake saw the boat with our Lord and His disciples passing along, they knew where it was bound for, and could hurry on, on foot, to be at the place to meet them. This consideration makes it easier to believe that there had been two feedings of the multitude on the same spot. And this spot must have been either on the very north of the western side of the lake, or else the people must have gone round the top of the lake to a spot on the north of the eastern side. The latter hypothesis seems to me the more probable, though I do not lay over much stress on the general agreement of ancient authorities that the scene of the miracle was on the eastern side, because this may have been no more than an inference suggested by our Lord's having reached the spot by boat. Schmiedel rejects the story that many of the audience had reached the spot by land, as an arbitrary invention of St Mark's. I rather count this arbitrary rejection as the proceeding of a thoughtless and incompetent critic.¹

¹ The suggestion of Schmiedel seems to have come from his coadjutor Prof. Edwin Abbott, a scholar of wonderful ingenuity and an even more astonishing absence of common sense. He seems to have lately made considerable acquaintance with Hebrew, and, like a boy with a new knife, goes about hacking everything with it. Many of the attempts to explain discordances between

THE FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDE

MARK vi. 35-38.

Καὶ ἥδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι, "Ερημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἥδη ὥρα πολλή· ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν. καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους καὶ δώσομεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν; ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε, καὶ γνόντες λέγουσιν, Πέντε, καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.

MATT. xiv. 15-18.

Ἄφ' ὧς δὲ γενομένης προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες, "Ερημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἥδη παρήλθεν· ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν· δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν. οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Οὐκ ἔχομεν ὧδε εἰ μὴ πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αὐτούς.

LUKE ix. 12, 13.

Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλί-
νειν· προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ
δώδεκα εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ἀπό-
λυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πο-
ρευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ
κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς καταλύ-
σωσιν καὶ εὐρωσιν ἐπιστι-
τισμόν, ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ
τόπῳ ἐσμέν. εἶπεν δὲ
πρὸς αὐτούς, Δότε αὐτοῖς
φαγεῖν ὑμεῖς. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν,
Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ
ἄρτοι πέντε καὶ ἰχθύες
δύο, εἰ μὴ τι πορευθέντες
ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάν-
τα τὸν λαὸν τούτου βρώ-
ματα.

St Luke's dependence on Mark is manifest. The employment of such a phrase as τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς cannot be an accidental coincidence. St Mark tells the story in a dramatic way, which St Luke abridges, and he uses his customary liberty in improving the language; but I find no trace of the use of a different source. St Mark's expression, for example, ὥρα πολλή, for a *late hour*, is an unusual one, and does not occur elsewhere, even in his own Gospel. St Luke gives

the Evangelists by supposed misunderstanding of a common Aramaic original are very ingenious, but to my mind very unconvincing. But here Abbott takes St Mark, whose intelligence he sadly under-rates; translates his plain assertions back into Hebrew and tries to explain them away as blunders. In this case περὶ is perfectly intelligible, and throws a flood of light on the whole occurrence, and (what would most have been a recommendation to Abbott) might have helped to eliminate something of the miraculous, hateful in his eyes, yet he imagines the word to be a confusion with one meaning *followed*. περὶ εὐν is used by St Luke in the sense of *to go by land*, Acts xx. 13.

St John certainly (John vi.) understands the miracle to have taken place on the eastern shore. If he is not acknowledged as a competent witness to the facts, at least he is a witness to the manner in which the story was understood in his time.

[Prof. E. Abbott's explanation is contained in *Clue: A Guide through Greek to Hebrew Scripture*, 166. "Mark has misunderstood the Hebrew 'at his feet,' i.e., at the feet of Jesus, and has taken it to mean 'with their feet.' The error is a very natural one, and occurs repeatedly in the Septuagint, e.g., 2 Sam. xv. 16-18. 'At his feet,' i.e., 'following him,' is there twice translated; τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν, περὶ ἡ."]

the same idea in other language, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν; but there was good reason why St Mark should not say, as St Matthew does, ὀψίας γενομένης. It may have been late afternoon, but not yet evening; for in verse 47 the Evangelist has something to tell of what happened when it was really evening. There may be a trace of Mark in what St Matthew presently says, ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθεν. In place however of St Mark's phrase *somewhat to eat*, both St Matthew and St Luke speak of the people buying βρώματα. St Matthew, too, has some additions of his own: *they have no need to go away*; and, when Jesus is told about the loaves and fishes, His command, *Bring them hither to me*. If I had found these variations in Luke, I should not think of them as evidence of the use of another authority; but St Matthew does not make such free use of his authorities as St Luke commonly does, but is often content to reproduce a story just as it had been told before.

MARK vi. 39-44.

Καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιθῆναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρῶσαι κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα. καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν. καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦσαν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων. καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.

MATT. xiv. 19-21.

Καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου, λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις. καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν, καὶ ἦσαν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις. οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.

LUKE ix. 14-17.

Ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, Κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ὡσεὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαντας. λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ. καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν πάντες, καὶ ἦρθη τὸ περισσεῦσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κόφινου δώδεκα.

In these verses, which conclude the account of the miracle, I find so little trace of any authority but Mark being used by the other two Evangelists that I feel disposed to withdraw my acknowledgment of the

possible use of a different source. There is astonishing verbal identity between the other two Evangelists and Mark; save that St Mark adds a number of pictorial details which St Matthew and St Luke have omitted, especially the graphic description of the companies seated at their meal, showing like flower-beds on the green grass. St Mark, as usual, is particular about his aorists. The act of blessing and breaking the bread was definite, and the aorists are properly used; but the distributing to the disciples was a continuous process, to which imperfects are applied. It is only in the last verse that we find any identity between Matthew and Luke which is not accounted for by their common use of Mark. The twelve basketfuls of fragments are described by St Matthew as holding τὰ περισσεύον τῶν κλασμάτων, and by St Luke τὸ περισσεύσαν αὐτοῖς, but the verb περισσεύω is not used by St Mark. The number of those who ate, which is given by St Mark definitely as five thousand, is said both by St Matthew and St Luke to have been about (ὥσεί) five thousand. They were probably quite right in judging that St Mark's was no more than a rough calculation: so many groups counted as fifty each.

But in my opinion the closest evidence of St Matthew's dependence on Mark is found in his adding women and children to the five thousand. How were these counted? Were they not fed, and so not included in the groups? I believe the truth to be that the women and children were developed by St Matthew out of Mark's πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες. Matthew takes ἄνδρες as not including women and children. In like manner, by parity of reasoning, St Matthew, xv. 38, adds women and children to the four thousand of the feeding of whom St Mark tells (viii. 9).

In connexion with this a curious point arises in St John's account of the same miracle (John vi. 10). He reports our Lord's command as ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν, followed by ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες,

and Bishop Westcott calls attention to the minute carefulness of the translators of the R.V., who render *Make the people sit down. . . So the men sat down.* But one has to ask, Did the Evangelist mean us to lay stress on the distinction between *ἄνθρωποι* and *ἄνδρες*? Does he wish us to understand that though Jesus had commanded that *the people* should be seated, the Apostles did not carry out the command as far as females were concerned? or was it that the women were too shy to avail themselves of the invitation, and preferred to remain standing and looking on while their fathers and brothers were feeding? If pressed to answer these questions, I should ask for proof that children were present at all. But I believe the truth to be that St John, who had evidently read Mark, reproducing his *two hundred denarii*, copied Mark's *ἄνδρες*, without meaning to make a distinction between this word and *ἄνθρωποι*.

At this point St Luke's following of Mark breaks off. He tells nothing of the dismissal of the multitude, or of the departure of our Lord's disciples, and the head wind they had to fight against, or of Jesus walking on the waters. This is not all; for many following sections St Luke dispenses with Mark's guidance, omitting some things we might have expected him to record: such, for example, as the story of the Syro-Phœnician; and in short, he never returns to following Mark's order of narration as he had done before.

JESUS SENDS THE DISCIPLES AWAY

MARK vi. 45-47.

Καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον. καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

MATT. xiv. 22, 23.

Καὶ [εὐθέως] ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι εἰς πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους. καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ' ἰδίαν προσεύξασθαι. ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ.

Here we have a direct contradiction between John and the Synoptics. According to the latter it was Jesus who dismissed the multitudes; according to John, He retired, leaving the crowds still assembled. The Synoptic account is: Night was falling, and the crowds were ready to go to their homes, the disciples, too, were preparing to depart, but their Master refused to go with them. It was no unusual practice of His to spend a whole night in solitary prayer (Mark i. 35; Luke vi. 12), and He desired to be alone now. They were unwilling to depart without Him, but He insisted, and saw them down to the shore, undertaking Himself to dismiss the multitudes. He sent the disciples away, having first arranged a place of meeting with them at Bethsaida. Then He dismissed the multitudes; and having done so, went up again to the mountain to pray. St Matthew and St Mark say nothing of the impression produced on the multitudes by the multiplication of the loaves; and in truth this was more likely to astonish those who bore the loaves than those who were fed by them. The latter would be grateful for the food, but had not the means of knowing from what slender materials the feast had been provided.

According to John, on the other hand, the astonishment of the crowd was so great that they would have taken Jesus by force to make Him a king, if He had not withdrawn Himself; and it was on this account, and not for the purpose of prayer, that He went up

to the mountain. When it was evening, and Jesus had not come back, the disciples went away without Him, leaving the undismitted multitude standing on the shore. How long they stood there we are not told; it is not likely that they stood there till next morning. At all events it was long enough for them to see that Jesus did not embark with the disciples, and that there was no other boat in which He could have followed them. Then on the next day these people who expected a repetition of the miracle themselves took boat, and went over to Capernaum, and to their surprise found Jesus there before them. The Evangelist adds, possibly in answer to difficulties raised by some of his audience, that though there had been no other boat on which Jesus could have left, there had subsequently come other boats over from Tiberias.

All authorities agree that the Fourth Gospel was written later than the other three, and in this case I have no hesitation in preferring the earlier account. I may add that though the danger that enthusiasm for their Master might lead the disciples into insurrectionary movements soon became a real one, it does not seem to have become formidable at quite so early a period of our Lord's history. At all events it affected rather our Lord's own disciples than His chance hearers.

THE TOILSOME ROWING

MARK. vi. 48-52.

MATT. xiv. 24-33.

In this passage the coincidences between Matthew and Mark are so numerous that we cannot doubt that St Matthew copied Mark, unless it might be that both drew from a common source, which in that case St Mark must have copied more literally than is his ordinary practice.

I have avoided the use of the word *storm* in speaking

of the present occurrence; for there is no reason to suppose that the boat was in any danger, or that there was anything tempestuous in the wind. We have already seen reason to believe that the place where the multitude was fed was at the north-eastern extremity of the lake; the object of the disciples was to go in the south-western direction towards Capernaum, on the middle of the western side. But they had to encounter the opposition of a very strong wind blowing against them. The boat in which they were was, as has been already said, a large and heavy one; and much exertion was necessary to force it along in the direction they wished to go. So after long toil in rowing, they found that they had made but little progress, and with the strong south wind blowing up the lake we need not be surprised if the progress were rather in the westerly direction than in the southern.

A few words may be added about the various reading in Matt. xiv. 24. The Received Text, following an overwhelming majority of the manuscripts, has ἡδὴ μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν, which is in close conformity with Mark vi. 45. But B reads ἡδὴ σταδίου πολλοὺς ἀπὸ γῆς ἀπεῖχεν. In this reading B has very little support, chiefly that of three cursives of the Ferrar group, and some oriental versions. We must notice, too, that this reading makes St Matthew forsake St Mark's guidance for St John's, who tells that the disciples had rowed, ὡς σταδίου εἴκοσι πέντε ἢ τριάκοντα. I must accept the generally accepted reading as the original text of Matthew, which I do not think could have been so nearly obliterated by a spurious emendation for which there is no apparent reason. Yet I have so much faith in B as to believe that this MS. here preserves for us a very ancient variation. About its origin I can only give a conjecture; but I believe that in the received reading we have the oldest text of Matthew, if not in this place of Q. But I have often been tempted to believe that the latest editor of Matthew was acquainted with St John's Gospel, and

the present Johannine form may be the introduction of the last editor, which, however, failed to supersede the older form.

Another question has to be considered with reference to the credibility of the Synoptic account: How was it that the disciples were willing to go away, and leave their Master behind? How did they expect that He was to get away and meet them again? They could not have imagined that He would walk on the water after them, else they would not have been so frightened when He actually did so; and if, as St John represents, there was no other boat left behind when the disciples left, they could not reasonably have been contented with the chance that other boats might subsequently come.¹ But a flood of light is cast on the story by St Mark's information (which Schmiedel and Abbot are so arrogant as to reject in the persuasion that they know better) that many of our Lord's audience had reached the scene of the miracle by walking round the head of the lake. Then it becomes quite intelligible that our Lord, being desirous of solitude, insisted on His disciples leaving Him, declaring His intention of returning in the same way by which many of His audience had come. And it was the quicker way too; for if the walkers had been able to outpace the boat in the calmer morning, still more would they be able to do so when the heavy boat had to be urged against a contrary wind.

THE WALKING ON THE WATER

It has not been my habit to discuss what is only told by one Evangelist, but it bears on our investigation to examine what St Matthew here tells, which gives clear evidence that he is drawing from another source besides Mark.

¹ I regard it as an indication that the writer of the Fourth Gospel had not himself been present on the occasion, that he seems to have no idea that the scene of the miracle could have been left in any way except by boat.

MARK vi. 51, 52.

Καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἀνεμος. καὶ λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο, οὐ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη.

MATT. xiv. 28-33.

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, εἰ σὺ εἶ, κέλευσόν με ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ἐλθέ. καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου Πέτρος περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα καὶ ἦλθεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. βλέπων δὲ τὸν ἀνεμον ἐφοβήθη, καὶ ἀρξάμενος καταποντίζεσθαι ἔκραξεν λέγων, Κύριε, σῶσόν με. εὐθέως δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκτελνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ὁλιγόπιστε, εἰς τί ἐδίστασας; καὶ ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἀνεμος. οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες, Ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ.

If we had to judge from internal evidence alone, we should rather have connected St Matthew's Gospel with Peter than St Mark's. St Matthew mentions Peter on occasions when St Mark is silent about him. To note no others, in addition to the narrative now under consideration, it is to St Matthew, not St Mark, we owe the record of the well-known words, *Thou art Peter, etc.*, and it is in St Matthew's Gospel that the title *πρῶτος* is attached to Peter's name. To account for this, we need no other hypothesis about the authorship of the First Gospel, or its source, than that it represents for us the Gospel history as told in Palestine, or as we may say, in the Church at Jerusalem. There the pre-eminence of Peter was long established, and though in the West the successful labours of Paul made his subsequently a rival name, yet the closer we study the history the more convinced we are of the leading part which Peter played in the proclamation of our Lord's claims both before His death and afterwards. It is in perfect harmony with all we read about him that he should have been on this occasion the first to recognise his Master, and to proclaim His presence to his brethren. Our Lord had already communicated to His disciples some of His own miraculous powers—of healing, and of casting out demons—and now that He has exhibited a power even more wonderful,

that of treading on the waters as if they were dry land, Peter has full faith that Jesus could empower him to do this too.

We have in John xxi. 7 a complete parallel: the story of Peter's dash into the water to welcome his Master. Nor let any one suppose that the argument from this parallel is removed by the rejection of the Fourth Gospel; nay, it is strengthened. No one can study that Gospel without being struck by the verisimilitude of many of the details recorded; so that we are forced to say that this is either founded on the report of an eye-witness, or is the work of a man of great dramatic power; for when mention is made of any whose names occur in the earlier Gospels, the characters are admirably preserved. If we accept the account in John xxi. as true, we cannot but think it likely that the same man could have acted as he is related to have done in Matt. xiv.; if the tale in John is but invention, we recognise that the inventor had based his story on the earlier tradition which St Matthew has preserved.

In connexion with this miracle, I must make honest confession that in my *Introduction, N.T.* (p. 9), trusting to second-hand information, I attempted to report something of the contents of a book I had never seen. The writings of Paulus do not appear to have ever had any circulation in Ireland; and when I wrote, as far as I know, no copy of them was accessible in Dublin. I thought myself justified in accepting the account of his speculations given by Strauss, who, sharing with him his desire to eliminate miracle from the history, might be supposed not likely to depreciate unfairly the success of another labourer in the same cause. And certainly, judging from the report of Strauss, the attempt of Paulus was such a disastrous failure that I did not care to make myself better acquainted with the details of the manner in which an absurd hypothesis had been worked out. But I ought, perhaps, to have reflected that two labourers in the same cause are not always each a fair judge of the success of his rival's

performance. Strauss, anxious for the success of his own mythical theory, was under a temptation to depreciate previous attempts to get rid of miracle from the Gospel history, and to proclaim every such attempt but his own to be an utter failure. And the result certainly has been that the majority of readers are willing to accept the verdict which each passes on the work of the other. Strauss's own hypothesis has certainly now outlived its day of popularity; and more recent critics have not had more success, who have hoped to reach the same results by different roads, as, for instance, by maintaining that editors blundered into miraculous stories, in attempting to piece different documents together, or in trying to translate into a language which they knew but imperfectly stories written in another language, the manuscripts of which were scarcely legible. These attempts are usually as unconvincing as Bentley's emendations of Milton, and provoke the remark how much ingenuity can be combined with a wonderful lack of common sense. I am sure that every theory will break down which does not acknowledge the complete historicity of our existing records, that is to say, which does not acknowledge that they contain what was honestly told and honestly believed by persons contemporary with the events related. I should have been glad then to examine whether any plausible case had been made by Paulus, who was willing to make this concession; but I am now too old to study a new book, even if I knew which of the works ascribed to him in catalogues was that which I ought to try to obtain.

In the present case, I have been tempted to try to recover what Paulus might have said, because a reaction has been produced in my mind by finding that what I had regarded as the most absurd and ridiculous of all attempts to explain away a miracle did not at all deserve these epithets, however unworthy of acceptance it might be, on account of its arbitrary rejection of an important part of the evidence. Though the Evangelists

relate that Jesus walked on the water, they do not say from what point He started. We are accustomed to think that it was from the same point from which the disciples had started; but our authorities do not say so, and we have reason to think that He and they must have been much nearer each other. If we accept the explanation of the disciples acquiescing in their Master's staying behind, that they expected to rejoin Him by His walking round the northern shore of the lake, this walk must have brought Him close to the water's edge. The disciples, though starting later, might have reached the same spot not much sooner than He. The strong wind may have brought them much nearer the northern shore than they expected, and, it being night, there was nothing to make them aware of their proximity to it. Minimisers do not succeed in making miracles more credible; and they would not gain much if they could prove that our Lord had not walked a mile on the surface of the lake, but only a hundred yards; this being a case where, as was said of the story of St Denis, the first step was the only difficulty. Therefore if Paulus got so far as to change the starting-point it would not be strange if he felt the necessity of carrying his explanation further, so as to exclude miracle altogether.

Though the disciples in the boat were not likely to notice any one walking on the shore, yet a passer-by could hardly fail to notice the presence of a large boat full of men, even if his attention were not attracted by the noise of the oars. The idea is then that Jesus, seeing how near the boat containing His disciples had come, proceeded to join it by walking through the shallow waters. The disciples were naturally startled by His unexpected appearance; but when Peter had satisfied himself that it was really his Master, being fully persuaded that there was nothing too wonderful to be beyond His power to perform, he came to the conclusion that Jesus had walked on the surface of the waters to the middle of the lake, where he supposed himself to be. And having no doubt that Jesus could

communicate like power to His chosen followers, he asked and obtained leave to join Him; and at first he found solid support for his feet, but when he proceeded to walk, He stumbled, and would have fallen, if his Master had not come to his help, and assisted him into the boat.

This explanation has to encounter the serious difficulties, that it contradicts St Mark's statement that *all the disciples saw Him walking on the sea*, and also that instead of His coming to join them, He seemed as if He was going to pass by them. But I do not count it an additional difficulty that Jesus might have been expected to undeceive His disciples, if they had been in error as to the way in which He had come to them. We have had some experience of the awe with which a great leader sometimes impresses his followers; but no awe could be so great as that with which His disciples regarded Jesus, whose mighty works never allowed them to forget that He stood on a higher level than they. So it seems to me unlikely that when they received Him into the boat, they ventured to put to Him the question, *Rabbi, how camest thou hither?*

OUR LORD'S RETURN TO THE WESTERN BANK

MARK vi. 53-56.

Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρέτ καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν. καὶ ἐξεληθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ἐπιγινόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον ὅλην τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς κραβάττοις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας περιφέρειν ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἔστιν. καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ εἰς πόλεις ἢ εἰς ἀγροὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἐτίθεσαν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας, καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἀν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἤψαντο αὐτοῦ ἐσώζοντο.

MATT. xiv. 34-36.

Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ. καὶ ἐπιγινόντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην, καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας, καὶ παρεκάλουν [αὐτὸν] ἵνα μόνον ἄψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὅσοι ἤψαντο διεσώθησαν.

It is only necessary to look at the number of words here common to Matthew and Mark (*διαπεράσαντες*,

Γεννησαρέτ, ἐπιγνόντες, παρεκάλουν, κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου), to be assured that the two accounts have a common Greek original; and I have no hesitation in preferring the explanation that St Matthew has abridged Mark to the theory that St Mark has expanded Matthew. I must recant the opinion I expressed (p. 319) on St John's authority (vi. 17), that the disciples in the boat were making for Capernaum; St Mark has expressly stated that the place of meeting arranged by their Master had been Bethsaida. We do not know exactly where that was, and possibly an Aramaic name may have suffered some distortion by Greek scribes. But the whole tenor of the story shows that it must have been a place on the western shore, a good deal north of Capernaum.¹ It would never have been arranged that their Master must walk all the way to Capernaum, before He could meet His disciples again. The boat would then land our Lord among the same people who, the morning before, had taken the same walk in the opposite direction in order to hear His teaching. It is not surprising then that He should meet from them an enthusiastic reception; and the last verse of the chapter describes the pressure to which He was subjected by the crowds, whom the fame of His gifts of healing brought round Him.

¹ See p. 342.

THE EATING WITH UNWASHEN HANDS

MARK vii. 1-5.

Καὶ συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοιναῖς χερσίν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους. (οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυνγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ ραντίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἐστὶν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ζεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων.) καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, Διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοιναῖς χερσίν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον;

MATT. xv. 1, 2.

Τότε προσέρχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων Φαρισαῖοι καὶ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες, Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.

LUKE xi. 37, 38.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλήσαι ἐρωτᾷ αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖος ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ' αὐτῷ· εἰσελθὼν δὲ ἀνέπεσεν. ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου.

With this seventh chapter it seems to me that we enter on a new section of St Mark's Gospel. Up to this point we find the two other Synoptics apparently relating unconnected anecdotes of our Lord's life, while through St Mark's account there runs a well-marked chronological thread enabling us to trace the progress of our Lord's influence and reputation, and also the gradual growth of hostility against Him. Here we have our Lord back again in Capernaum, and the surroundings are just the same as before in Mark iii., where we are told of the offence taken by Scribes and Pharisees because He ate with publicans and sinners, and because His disciples did not keep the Pharisaic fasts.

We need not indeed be surprised at finding our Lord again in Capernaum, although no special mention is made of His journey thither; because we have every

reason to think that this was the direction in which He was going when He landed from the boat. But what follows in Mark is only a collection of isolated anecdotes; and we are induced to believe that St Mark is here but relating at length a story which had been told by a predecessor, when we find the same story in Luke. We have already seen that St Luke is now no longer dependent on Mark, whose order of narration he here quite forsakes; and there is no trace of Mark in the language in which this story is told. St Luke, when he relates a traditional saying of our Lord's, is always careful to give an account of something that suggested it, as he does here by telling of the Pharisee's invitation. We have only in this case to contrast St Luke's independence of Mark with St Matthew's dependence. St Matthew, no doubt, abridges Mark's account, by omitting the explanation of Jewish customs, which was necessary to make Gentile readers understand what was meant by *κοιναῖς χερσίν*, but which was not needed by Jews.

If this section is rightly placed by St Mark immediately after the return of our Lord from the other side of the lake, we can understand how during a tour in which they had to mix with many people, asking and obtaining hospitality from many who though Jews were not Pharisees, the disciples might have come to share their Master's indifference to the observance of precepts which could claim no divine authority. Pharisaism was more likely to flourish in a small city than in the wider atmosphere of the country.

We are told that on this occasion the objection was raised by the Pharisees and certain of the Scribes who came from Jerusalem (possibly a deputation sent to report on the proceedings of the new prophet) just as on a previous occasion, Mark iii. 22, it was Scribes from Jerusalem that put forward the theory that He cast out devils through collusion with Beelzebub. I do not know that we can count it a slip that St Matthew transposes, and says *Pharisees and Scribes from Jerusalem*.

No doubt some of the Scribes resident in Capernaum were Pharisees, but these were less likely than their visitors to take umbrage at the non-observance of Pharisaic rules.

OUR LORD'S REPLY

MARK vii. 6-13.

MATT. xv. 3-9.

The comparison of the two Gospels in this section calls for little remark. St Matthew has transposed two of Mark's sections, and certainly with the effect of improving the effectiveness of the rebuke.

It seems to me likely that this retaliation on the teaching of the Scribes may have been elicited by some conduct of theirs at a time when, as men zealous for some public cause will occasionally do, they urged men to contribute to it that on which private duties had a stronger claim.

WHAT DEFILES THE MAN

MARK vii. 14-16.

Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε. οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἕξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενά ἐστιν τὰ κοινούντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

MATT. xv. 10, 11.

Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε· οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

In this section Matthew is practically identical with Mark; except that by the introduction of εἰς τὸ στόμα St Matthew gives the sentence a more pointed form.

THE EXPLANATION

MARK vii. 17-23.

MATT. xv. 12-20.

St Matthew is in this section making use of an authority independent of Mark. The special mention of Peter suggests that this authority may be the same as that to which we owe some other traditions which

give prominence to Peter. I cannot doubt that St Matthew is here using Q, the idea of the blindness of those who undertook to guide being very prominent in Matt. xxiii., which may certainly be referred to Q. Our Lord's rebukes to the Pharisees contained in that chapter will be more conveniently considered in connexion with Mark xii. 38. St Luke, however, vi. 39, shows his knowledge of this section of Q. The next verse in this passage of Luke seems also to be referred to Q, viz., *The disciple is not above his master*, which we find in Matt. x. 24, and also made use of by St John (xiii. 16; xv. 20). In neither case does St Luke derive his phraseology from Mark.

In the recital of the evil things which proceed from the heart, St Matthew follows the Decalogue order—murder, adultery, theft, false witness; so also Matt. xix. 18. St Mark considerably enlarges the list, and makes no attempt to follow the order of the Decalogue.

A question arises as to where these sayings were uttered. There were three stages in the discussion. First our Lord addresses Scribes and Pharisees in the absence of the multitude; then having in His discourse with them enunciated a general principle which it was useful to all to hear, He calls the multitude to listen to it; lastly, He goes into the house, probably to take food, and there He repeats and explains to His disciples what He had said to the objectors. It has been suggested that the Pharisees may have forced themselves into the house with the disciples when they retired to take food; but this theory is untenable, since we are told that, in the third stage, when they retired to the house, no one was present but the disciples. What I understand then is that when our Lord was teaching the people, there came up this deputation of leading members of the synagogue to interrogate Jesus on what they had noticed or had been told of the non-observance by His disciples of well-established Jewish usages, that the members of

this deputation approached our Lord, the multitudes remaining in the background; that when He had given the objectors His answer, He repeated it aloud for the benefit of those who had not heard it; and finally, when the time came for retirement, the disciples, as St Mark tells us their custom was, sought explanation of an utterance which they had imperfectly understood.

I was at first tempted to think that St Mark had misplaced the section we are considering, since it seemed to fit more naturally with the state of feeling exhibited in the second and third chapters. But it is always dangerous to try to improve on your authorities; and on consideration I find no good reason for dissenting from St Mark's arrangement. He had told of the offence given by our Lord to the Church rulers, who in consequence were stirring up the civil authorities against Him. He therefore ceased to make Capernaum His headquarters, and departed with His disciples for a missionary tour, though not to any great distance. Now on His return, He finds the bitterness of feeling against Him in no degree abated. He had not been lost sight of by the authorities at Jerusalem, who soon find new cause of complaint against Him; for His teaching as to the unimportance of ceremonial defilement, as compared with breaches of the moral law, however universally accepted at the present day, must have seemed to the rulers as not only rejecting various rules then generally observed on the authority of Pharasaic teachers held in high repute, but as cutting at the roots of the observance of the entire ceremonial law ordained by Moses. St Mark does not tell what steps were then taken by the rulers to excite the alarm of our Lord and His disciples; but it is most natural that the next thing we read of Him is that He has entirely left the district and gone into the borders of Tyre and Sidon.

It seems to me strange that the sayings of our Lord recorded in this chapter were not made use of by St

Paul in his controversy about eating meats. Can the solution be that the only record of our Lord's words with which St Paul was acquainted was that represented in St Luke's Gospel, which does not contain the section we have had under consideration?

THE SYRO-PHŒNICIAN WOMAN

MARK vii. 24-30.

MATT. xv. 21-28.

Explanations, which I cannot accept as satisfactory, have been offered why this miracle was not recorded by St Luke. As regards the omission of the section concerning eating with unwashed hands, it has been said that St Luke omits it as writing for Gentiles, who would not be interested in a controversy about Jewish customs; yet certainly the principle which our Lord there laid down had important bearings on early controversies in the Christian Church. As regards the present section, some explanation is certainly necessary; for the story is one which we should have expected to have had a lively interest for the historian of the foundation of Gentile churches, namely, the account of a miracle performed by our Lord Himself for the benefit of a Gentile.

It has been suggested that St Luke was unwilling to acknowledge the limitations of our Lord's own mission, and His reluctance to transgress its boundaries. St Luke has not copied the restriction imposed on the Apostles when first sent out: *Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, this last phrase being used in this very section. Yet surely since the result was that our Lord did go beyond the limits He had marked out for Himself, the history had more interest for an advocate than for an opponent of the extension of Gospel preaching outside the Jewish

boundaries, which we here learn, our Lord, for whatever reason, Himself went beyond. St Luke shows no unwillingness to acknowledge that it was to the Jews exclusively the Gospel was first preached. Note the *Unto you first* of Acts iii. 26, and the *It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you* of Acts xiii. 46. St Mark in this section describes the repulse of the Syro-Phœnician woman as only conveyed in the words *Let the children first be filled, etc.* St Luke's master, St Paul, distinctly taught that the extension of the Gospel to Gentiles was consequent on a previous rejection of it by the Jews (Rom. xi. 11), and St Luke himself takes pleasure in giving historical proofs that it was thus that Gentiles came to be included in the Church (Acts xviii. 6; xxii. 18-21; xxviii. 28).

We must then reject the hypothesis that St Luke, though acquainted with this story, omitted it for some doctrinal reason. On the other hand, I have already called attention to the fact that St Luke, who has carefully followed St Mark's order down to the end of the account of the feeding of the five thousand, there forsakes his dependence on Mark, and never returns to it again. I have drawn the inference that St Luke's acquaintance with St Mark's Gospel did not extend beyond the point where we can trace his use of it. But another explanation may be given. It is clear that for this later part of the history St Luke had obtained other materials to which he rightly attached the highest value, preserving for us as they do some parables and other specimens of our Lord's teaching which we could ill spare. Not to say that there appear to have been then conventional limitations of the length to which a "book" ought to extend, it was clearly impossible to relate everything which our Lord had said or done. And therefore in order to make use of these new materials it was necessary to put aside some of the authorities used in the earlier chapters. Whatever account we give of this matter, the result is that we have now but two narratives to compare; and in this comparison the

conclusion to which I come is that St Matthew is not now entirely dependent on Mark, but that both Evangelists used an earlier authority.

MARK vii. 24a.

Ἐκείθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς
τὰ ὄρια Τύρου [καὶ Σιδῶνος].

MATT. xv. 21.

Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ
Σιδῶνος.

Weiss uses Mark's ἀναστὰς to connect this verse with the discourse concerning the eating with unwashed hands. His idea is that St Mark means that our Lord got up from the usual sitting attitude of a teacher. I believe on the other hand that Mark's ἀναστὰς and Matthew's ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν mean exactly the same thing, and that both here and elsewhere Weiss finds more in ἀναστὰς than the Evangelist meant to convey by it. What object could the narrator have in emphasising our Lord's change of attitude? How could He possibly get from Capernaum to the district about Tyre without standing up?

καὶ Σιδῶνος.—These words are questioned by the critical editors, though attested by $\aleph B$ and other authorities whom they usually follow without hesitation. The dissentients are $DL\Delta$ and some early old Latin MSS.; and besides, Origen quotes the passage without this addition (*Comm. in Matt.*, tom. xi. 16). However the main reason for rejection is that Matthew has this addition, and it is easier to account for the received reading as completed by an addition from Matthew than to explain why the words, if genuine, should have been omitted. It is urged that in relating the next anecdote (vii. 31) Mark is represented by the oldest MSS. as stating that our Lord, coming from the borders of Tyre, passed through Sidon, whence it is inferred that in verse 24, he must have mentioned only Tyre, without adding Sidon, an inference however which by no means necessarily follows. I am disposed to look on the common source of $\aleph B$ as an authority by no means infallible, but yet free from modern sources of error; and I count the temptation to alter Mark into conformity

with Matthew to be one which only beset scribes who lived at a later date than that of this common source. I own that Tyre and Sidon are as commonly spoken of together as Spain and Portugal are among ourselves; so that if only Tyre had been mentioned it might be natural to add *and Sidon*. If St Matthew's reading is thus accounted for, why might not St Mark have yielded to the same temptation. At all events, whichever be the reading, it is plain that St Mark represents our Lord as having been on this visit within the borders of Sidon as well as of Tyre.

In deciding that St Matthew's account is not derived from Mark, Weiss is greatly influenced by the *καὶ ἰδοὺ* with which it commences, which he is accustomed to regard as an infallible sign of translation from the Aramaic. That this formula comes from the Aramaic I do not doubt; but we are not safe in concluding from the use of this formula that any particular story in which it is found must be the translation of an Aramaic original. I have never been able to find convincing proof that St Luke was acquainted with Aramaic. In sections of his which are parallel with others in Matthew the common use of Greek words leads me to believe that St Luke knew the Aramaic original only through the medium of a translation. Now the *καὶ ἰδοὺ* is as frequent in St Luke's writings as in Matthew. I lay no stress on the Gospel, nor on the earlier chapters of the Acts, which might be said to have been derived from an Aramaic original, but it also occurs frequently in the later chapters where we have no reason to think that the original is anything but Greek. In particular, St Luke (Acts x. 30) puts the *καὶ ἰδοὺ* in the mouth of the Roman centurion, Cornelius.

Nevertheless, internal evidence shows that in this place St Matthew has used a source independent of Mark, which I should have been willing to call Q, if it had not been that I have habitually given this title to the source of things common to Matthew and Luke, and not found in Mark; but this story is not recognised

by St Luke. This version of this section may possibly have been earlier than Mark ; but if so, St Mark makes some corrections of it which I cannot hesitate to accept. From St Matthew's account, we should have been tempted to imagine that our Lord had gone to Tyre in order to preach the Gospel to a heathen audience ; but if so we cannot understand why He should then decline to cure the disease of a heathen suppliant, declaring that it was only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel that He had been sent. But St Mark gives us to understand that He gave no public instruction in the Tyrian district, being there *incognito*, and desirous that His presence should not be known. This retirement is well accounted for by the constantly increasing violence of the opposition against Him in Capernaum, as the result of which He seemed likely to meet at once the fate of John the Baptist. In this case Herod would not have been deterred by *fear of the people* ; for by silencing this popular demagogue he would have gratified those who considered themselves best entitled to speak in the name of the Jews.

In what follows, the story as told by St Matthew conveys a different impression from that told by St Mark. We should have concluded from Matthew's *κράζει* that as our Lord's disciples were going along, this woman followed them with cries for help so vociferous that the disciples interceded for her in order to be rid of her importunity. St Mark lays the scene in the house where our Lord found a lodging. Notwithstanding His desire that His presence should not be made public, St Mark's statement that it was impossible that it should be altogether concealed is very credible. This woman might have known of Him from some of the multitude which thronged to Him in Galilee, among whom St Mark tells (iii. 8), there were some from the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon ; or she might have known of Him through acquaintance with one of His disciples. We should decide in favour of the latter solution if we could be quite sure that St

Matthew has rightly represented her as addressing Him as *Thou Son of David*. This was the form of address which was most calculated to awake the just alarm of the civil authorities; and St Mark does not represent our Lord's disciples as using it until the last journey to Jerusalem; but St Matthew is less careful about these small details of chronological propriety.

The account in Mark does not absolutely contradict that in Matthew, because it is no doubt possible that the woman having made her request in the house, followed our Lord and His disciples into the street. St Mark's imperfect tenses (ἡρώτα, ἔλεγεν) show that there had been a continuous series of entreaties met by silence or refusal, though he himself has not recorded them. In this narrative there are more autoptic touches in Matthew than in Mark. According to Matthew, our Lord for a time met her entreaties simply by silence, until at length the disciples, wearied by her importunity, begged Him to give her an answer, and send her away; and it was then He told her that He had been sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

THE RETURN TO GALILEE

MARK vii. 31.

Καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων
Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλα-
σσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν
ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως.

MATT. xv. 29a.

Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκείθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ἦλθεν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλι-
λαίας.

Although St Mark gives no particulars about our Lord's journey to the Phœnician country, does not say how long He remained there, and gives only one anecdote of His visit, yet he is careful to record his return; for St Mark's Gospel is not a collection of isolated anecdotes, but aims at being a history. And his account quite falls in with the conclusion to which the preceding chapters had led us, viz., that retirement was made necessary by the danger to which Jesus was exposed by the determined opposition of the Jewish authorities, which had now gained the support of

Herod. So going up northward from the Tyrian district, He returns, not to Capernaum, but to the opposite side of the lake of Gennesaret, where the hostility to Him was less organised and less formidable.

THE EPHPHATHA MIRACLE

MARK vii. 32-37.

For the points of similarity between this miracle and the curing of the blind man at Bethsaida, see further, p. 348.

Though St Matthew does not relate this miracle, he has in this place a paragraph, xv. 29b-31, describing in general terms the miracles which our Lord performed, and the astonishment they produced. He says that *the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking, and the blind seeing*. I consider that we may safely infer from the fact that *the dumb speaking* has the first place in this list, that St Matthew was acquainted with St Mark's account of this Ephphatha miracle. The thing is in itself probable; for St Matthew has been plainly using Mark in the paragraphs which precede and which follow. St Mark signalises this as exciting more astonishment than any other of our Lord's miracles: *μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον. καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξέπλη- ῖσσοντο*. There was also in Q an account of the healing of another (or possibly the same) dumb man (Matt. ix. 32; xii. 22; Luke xi. 14); and here too special mention is made of the wonder which this form of miracle excited: *It was never so seen in Israel*.

THE SECOND FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDE

MARK viii. 1-10.

MATT. xv. 32-39.

The first question that here arises is whether I can be justified in the title I have given to this section ; in other words, the question whether we have in Mark vi. and Mark viii. accounts of two distinct occurrences, or two accounts of the same occurrence by independent witnesses. There are so many points of agreement between the two that we are tempted to think that both accounts are descriptions of the same incident ; yet there are some points of difference, such as would oblige us to regard the information possessed by one of the narrators as defective or erroneous, if he is speaking of the same occurrence as the other. I do not myself hold any principles which would oblige me to reject offhand either supposition as antecedently improbable. I see no force in the argument that we cannot believe that what is here attributed to our Lord really happened, because He is said to have done the like on another occasion. I should have thought the inference lay the other way ; that is to say, that it was more likely than not that our Lord should use a second time the course of proceeding which He had successfully employed on a former similar occasion. Then, instead of allowing the multitudes to disperse in order to obtain a mid-day meal, He directed the disciples to make them sit down, and offer them hospitality from their own resources ; and slender as they were, they proved to be more than sufficient. Was there any reason why He should not give the same direction now ? We can lay no stress on the fact that this second feeding of the multitude is not narrated by St Luke ; because St Luke appears to make no use of any part of the section of Mark in which the story is told.

Some of the differences pointed out between the accounts present no difficulties except on the hypothesis

of the absolute inerrancy of the Evangelists in every detail, however minute. For instance, in one account the number of persons fed is estimated as four thousand, and in the other as five thousand. But neither account professes to give more than a rough estimate. Suppose the actual number to have been a few hundred more than four thousand, might it not very honestly have been reported as about four thousand by the one, and as about five thousand by the other? So in like manner about the number of the loaves. Can we say that our faith in the honesty of the witnesses must be destroyed if one reported them as five, and the other as seven? Might not one have chanced to see two more than had been counted by the other; or, on the other hand, might not one have known that two out of the original stock of seven had been consumed by the disciples before the multitude was fed? Guesses would be interminable if we attempted either to decide between the relative probabilities of the two accounts, or even if we ventured to pronounce them irreconcilable.

The one solid fact is that, whether the two accounts relate to the same miracle or not, St Mark believed them to be reports of two different incidents. This we learn from what he goes on to tell (viii. 19, 20), how, when the disciples were uneasy because they had forgotten to bring a sufficient supply of bread, Jesus reproached them with having forgotten how He had been able with five loaves to satisfy the wants of five thousand, and with seven the wants of four thousand. There is no place in which the use of Mark by St Matthew is more manifest than that in the parallel passage of the First Gospel (xvi. 9, 10): he not only adheres to Mark's order, but copies most of his language, including his recognition of the distinctness of the two miracles of feeding. In this section I have not thought it worth while to print Matthew's and Mark's accounts side by side; for the copying is so close that I cannot treat St Matthew's as an independent account, throwing light on St Mark's, or giving independent confirmation of it.

It seems to me a certain inference that St Mark here used two different sources: the one which related the feeding of the five thousand being that which had obtained the widest circulation, the other, though recognised by St Mark as authentic, disagreeing in some details from the other. The detail which I conceive St Mark must have found it impossible to reconcile with the history of the other miracle is that, in the former, the whole story turns on our Lord's sending the disciples away without Him, and Himself remaining behind; in the latter, the disciples and He depart together in the boat.

It seems to me that in these eighth and ninth chapters, St Mark has worked in some independent documents of whose authenticity he was convinced, but which he had not the means of accurately fitting in with the previous history. In the present case we are brought back to the *Sea of Galilee*, and the disciples are able to use *the boat*. But how did they come by it again? They do not appear to have remained by the lake; for soon after we read of them as at Cæsarea Philippi; and we have no distinct mention of the return of Jesus to Capernaum until chapter ix. 30, 33. St Mark's accounts of the time and place of this second feeding of a multitude are equally vague. I do not think it is possible for us to say with certainty whether the place was on the east or west side of the lake. On consideration, the best solution that occurs to me is to avail ourselves of the Evangelist John's information, that Bethsaida was the city of Andrew and Peter. James and John would seem to have had their abode at Capernaum; and probably had made arrangements for the sale of the fish, which made it convenient to their acquaintances, and perhaps cousins, Andrew and Peter, to enter into partnership with them. I take it that when our Lord and His disciples left the lake for a northern journey, Peter's boat was laid up at Bethsaida, and was recovered again on their return; and that in the last period of our Lord's activity, Bethsaida was His headquarters.

I confess that I find the evidence very unsatisfactory that there was a Bethsaida on the western bank. The whole difficulty arises from St Mark's statement (vi. 45) that when our Lord constrained His disciples to embark without Him, He bade them go before Him *to the other side*, πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν. And as it is generally assumed that the feeding of the multitude took place on the eastern side, it seems to follow that the Bethsaida here spoken of must be on the western. That πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν is the true reading of Mark is confirmed by St Luke, who appears to have got the mention of Bethsaida from Mark. Yet if we take the view which the story seems to suggest, that the scene of the feeding of the multitude was at the north-eastern extremity of the lake, this must be itself close to the better known Bethsaida. When He left it, the document used by St Mark told that He *came into the parts of Dalmanutha*. It would seem that St Matthew did not recognise *Dalmanutha* as the name of a place, for he substitutes *Magadan*. But our information is not sufficient to enable us to identify either place; and we must be content to leave the locality uncertain.

If St Mark here used another document, I cannot but admire the scrupulous fidelity with which he preserved it. He carefully records all those small details which have been relied on as proving that the two accounts of the feeding of a multitude could not refer to the same occurrence. In particular, both in the direct account and also later, when our Lord's reference to this miracle is recorded, the distinction is preserved that in the one case the fragments filled twelve κόφινοι, in the other seven σφυρίδες. The κόφινος was a small basket, of which the same use could be made in carrying light articles that pedestrians now make of knapsacks. The σφυρίς might be large enough to hold a man (Acts ix. 25). If I am right as to the larger size of the σφυρίς, I may present to those who like such methods of exposition a reconciliation of the twelve *cophinoi* with the seven *spurides*. If each of the twelve distributors of the loaves

emptied his *cophinos* full of fragments into the larger basket, it might easily be that twelve of the one would just fill seven of the other. But the chief difficulty I feel in this explanation is that while it is natural enough that each of the disciples should carry with him his little travelling basket, I do not see why they should bring with them the larger ones, unless we suppose that they obtained them in the place where they landed.

Although, as I have said, I could with equal ease accept the theory that the two accounts refer to the same or to different occurrences, the scale in my mind is turned in favour of the former by the disciples' question, *Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread here in a desert place?* a question which they need scarcely have asked if they had seen the problem successfully solved before. It must however be acknowledged that St Mark shows himself constantly impressed by the stupidity or hardness of heart of the witnesses of our Lord's miracles, who failed to draw from them the conclusion which they ought to have suggested. A striking example is found if we compare the accounts given by St Matthew and St Mark of the impression made by the miracle of our Lord's walking on the water. St Matthew says, xiv. 33, *And they that were in the boat worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God*; St Mark says, vi. 51, *And they were sore amazed in themselves; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened.* This characteristic of St Mark will have to be considered when we come to decide whether the Evangelist had any share in the Appendix, which betrays in three successive verses, xvi. 11, 13, 14, the writer's astonishment at the unbelief of those who were told of our Lord's resurrection.

THE DEMAND OF A SIGN FROM HEAVEN

MARK viii. 11, 12.

Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συνζητεῖν αὐτῷ, ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει, Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον; ἀμὴν λέγω, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον.

MATT. xvi. 1, 2a, 4a.

Καὶ προσελθόντες [οἱ] Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι πειράζοντες ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιδείξαι αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, . . .

Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωανᾶ.

In commenting on Mark iii. 22 (p. 205), we have already considered the charge that our Lord cast out demons by Beelzebub. In that chapter St Mark does not record the demand for *a sign from heaven*; but the combined testimony of Matthew and Luke leads us to think that Q had placed in the same connexion the charge of alliance with Beelzebub and the demand for *a sign* (see p. 216). St Mark has here separated what the other two Evangelists have placed together. He puts the one at the very beginning of our Lord's ministry, and the other at the later period, when admiring crowds had gathered round Him. When we reflect on it, we see the chronological fitness of this arrangement.

What seems first to have led people to recognise in Jesus powers not possessed by ordinary men was the authority with which He commanded demoniacs, and forced them to obey. And if the speculation is not irreverent, it may be that it was thus our Lord's Human Soul awoke to a knowledge of His power. Possessed, as all must own He was, of pre-eminent goodness, and courage founded on faith in the power and love of His heavenly Father, He went boldly up to those frantic creatures from whom others shrank in terror, and found that gentleness and love succeeded where threats and force had failed. In any case, we may gather from St Mark's account that what forced the ecclesiastical rulers to give consideration to the claims of this new teacher was His publicly effecting the cure of a demoniac in

a synagogue. Thenceforward the reality of His power over demons could not be questioned; and it became necessary to accept this as evidence of His divine commission, or else to give some other explanation how He possessed this power. Thus the charge of alliance with Beelzebub has a fitting place in the epoch to which St Mark has assigned it. But at that early stage the idea that Jesus might be the promised Messiah does not seem to have occurred to the most devoted of His adherents; and it was not then that enquiry would be made whether the signs had been exhibited which were to precede the coming of the expected Deliverer. But it was otherwise at the period with which St Mark is now dealing. The fame of Jesus had now passed beyond the villages in the neighbourhood of Capernaum, and had spread through all the North of Palestine. In Decapolis He was followed by multitudes wherever He showed Himself. People had begun to ask, Who was this, so like what one had heard about the prophets of old, with authority to rebuke, with wisdom to teach, from whom diseases fled, to whom the powers of nature seemed to bow? Could this be Elijah himself come to prepare the way for the coming Deliverer? Nay, could he even be that Deliverer himself? Presently St Mark tells of these questionings among the people as to what Jesus might be; and it was natural that then, too, objection should be raised on account of the non-appearance of the signs the absence of which forbade the identification of Jesus with the Messiah.

THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES

Mark viii. 13-21.

Matt. xvi. 4b-12.

We should not be surprised if the disciples forgot to bring any bread with them; but it does seem to need explanation, if they brought any bread with them, why

only one loaf? We have a satisfactory answer if it was the case that they were just returning from a former trip and had neglected to replenish the store with which they had started, of which they now find only one loaf was remaining. This story then fits in very well with the supposition that Dalmanutha lay on the lower end of the lake. Returning from it, and having the intention of going back to the north-eastern side of the lake, they landed at Capernaum on their way, but there omitted to replenish their stock of bread. The only question would be whether εἰς τὸ πέραν could be used of a mere row up the lake; but it certainly involved a crossing, if, as we must suppose, Dalmanutha lay on the eastern side.

It may be asked, How did the scarcity of bread suggest the idea of leaven? I hope it is not fanciful to connect with this the tradition preserved by St John, vi. 4, that the feeding of the multitudes which he relates took place immediately before the Feast of the Passover. The question which the disciples had been discussing among themselves might have been, Could they expect to be able to buy unleavened bread on the other side of the lake where Gentiles were numerous and perhaps in a majority? Then it would be natural that our Lord should teach them what was the kind of leaven of which they ought to beware.

The obligations of St Matthew to Mark in this passage are quite unmistakable. We must note the very great number of common words, εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν, διαλογίζομαι, γνοῖς, οὐπω νοεῖτε; and I hope I shall not be thought fanciful if I imagine I see a trace of acquaintance with Mark in a case where St Matthew alters Mark's language. A reader might easily think there was something strange in the juxtaposition of two kindred words with which St Mark begins our Lord's address, ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε. St Matthew preserves the ὁρᾶτε, but alters βλέπετε into προσέχετε. Luke agrees with Matthew in προσέχετε. We have not the authority of St Luke for this story, but he had

acquaintance, no doubt from Q, with the saying of our Lord on which Mark's story is founded, which St Luke, xii. 1, gives in the form :

Ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ πρῶτον, Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης, ἣτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις, τῶν Φαρισαίων.

In another point where St Matthew has forsaken Mark's guidance he must be pronounced to have certainly gone wrong. If we remember that our Lord's change of headquarters was made necessary by the combination against Him of the Pharisees and Herod's people (see also Luke xiii. 31), we are not surprised at His warning His disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod, where it is by no means implied that the two kinds of leaven were the same ; for what the two parties had in common sprang rather from moral faults than intellectual errors. But after our Lord's death, the Sadducees played so active a part among the opponents of the new religion, in which opposition the Pharisees were united with them, that it became natural to join together Pharisees and Sadducees ; and we need not be surprised that Matthew should write in verse 6, *Pharisees and Sadducees* instead of *Pharisees and Herod*. But when Matthew goes on to explain that by *leaven* our Lord meant the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees, we cannot but remark that the teaching of these two sects had so little in common that St Paul was afterwards able to enlist on his behalf one of these sects in opposition to the other.

THE HEALING OF THE BLIND MAN AT BETHSAIDA

MARK viii. 22-26.

The account of the cure of this blind man probably reached St Mark through the same authority as that

from which he derived his knowledge of the Ephphatha miracle, which, like this, does not seem to have been included in Q.

These two miracles have many common features. First we are told in general terms that *they* (vii. 32 ; viii. 22) bring the sufferer to Jesus, without any explanation who *they* were ; secondly, Jesus takes the patient aside from the crowd of curious spectators (vii. 33 ; viii. 23) ; in both, there is a minute description of the manual treatment used by our Lord ; finally, in both cases our Lord gives distinct commands that the miracle should not be published. It was just at this period that the malice of His enemies forced Him to attempt to preserve an *incognito* ; and that there would be danger to Him from the assembling of crowds, such as the fame of His miracles was wont to gather round Him.

The peculiarity of the miracle now under consideration is its gradual performance by successive steps, to which we find nothing parallel in the rest of the Gospel history.

The first command is, *Go to thy home*. Apparently the man had been brought from a distance, and did not reside in the village. Then the command, *Do not even enter into the village*, is very intelligible ; and I am disposed to accept the very copiously attested addition, *Nor tell it to any in the village*. This may have been omitted by some copyists who imagined that it meant that if he did go into the village, he was to tell no one, whereas I take the meaning simply to be that he was to tell no one who would carry the news into the village.

OUR LORD'S DECLARATION OF HIS MESSIAHSHIP

MARK viii. 27-30.

MATT. xvi. 13-20.

LUKE ix. 18-21.

Previous to the present section, we have for some time only been able to compare the Gospels of St

Matthew and St Mark. Now St Luke's version also comes under consideration.

It is only natural that the present section should have its place in all our three authorities. Though St Matthew at the commencement follows Mark very closely, he has much to tell which he did not learn from that authority ; in particular, the words of commendation with which he records Peter's confession. St Luke, though he retains some of the words found also in Mark (*ἐπὶ πρῶτα, ἐπέτιμυσεν*), yet makes no mention of the place where our Lord accepted the disciples' recognition. We may well believe that before this discourse there had been some doubt, possibly some difference of opinion, among the disciples as to who or what their Master might be. It must then have been an epoch in their history when our Lord, seeing that the time had now come, put His seal on the opinion which they were beginning to hold with more or less confidence. This was a revelation which they could never forget, and they could not fail to register in their memory the place where it had been made them.

St Mark appears to have had no detailed information about our Lord's tours to the north of the lake of Gennesaret ; and concerning this part of His work has only given us a few unconnected anecdotes. It is quite conceivable that it was from St Peter he heard that the scene of this revelation of the Master's claims was one of the villages near Cæsarea Philippi. St Luke appears to have had his information from another of the disciples ; for it was a different thing which dwelt on his memory, and that one which commends itself as true information, namely, that this declaration was made just when the disciples had been witnesses of our Lord's praying to His Father. Like prayer preceded His choice of the Apostles. What more natural than that, ere making known to them the message they had to deliver, He should once more have sought His Father's blessing on themselves and on their message.

A trifling difference between St Luke's version and

St Mark's may be noticed. St Mark records our Lord's question as *Who do men say that I am?* St Luke has *Who do the multitudes say that I am?* The latter seems to be a literary improvement, as bringing out more sharply the contrast *But who say ye that I am?* Yet, I do not think it is a real improvement; for it represents our Lord as, at the moment He puts the question, assuming that the answer given by the multitudes would not be the same as that given by the disciples.

All our Evangelists agree in making Peter the mouthpiece of the disciples' confession; and if there were any doubts among them as to their Master's claims, it is certain that Peter shared none of them. All attempts to explain away our Lord's miracles have got to take account of the fact that one who was for a considerable time His daily companion came to be impressed with an undoubting belief that there was nothing which His power could not accomplish. All through this latter part of the Saviour's life, Peter was the leading spirit; and so he remained when the removal of their Lord imposed a new enterprise on the orphaned Church.

According to St Matthew's account, this dignity was at this time conferred on Peter in reward for his noble confession, which was declared to be the result of a divine revelation. This section of Matthew (xvi. 17-19), not being found in our other authorities, does not come to be considered in this comparative study of the Gospels in which I have engaged; yet its absence from the others needs some explanation. I think that the whole section relating our Lord's acceptance of the title of God's anointed is one which could not have been absent from that earliest Gospel which I have called Q. Yet if St Luke had found there this bestowal of a prerogative on Peter, I do not think he would have omitted to include it in his Gospel; and certainly not if he supposed that our Lord was thereby instituting a permanent constitution for His Church to all time. I could not venture to conclude from Mark's silence that

he was unacquainted with this passage, because I find him in other cases abridging his authorities, apparently for no other reason than in order to keep his work from swelling beyond the limits which he had assigned to it; but I bear in mind that in the history of the Passion St Matthew makes several additions to Mark's story which bear tokens of later date.

The hypothesis by which I myself explain these additions is that St Matthew's Gospel, as we have it now, preserves for us the Gospel story as it was told in the Palestinian Churches at a later period than that when St Mark's Gospel was written, and that it includes some things not found in the original Aramaic of the First Gospel. Such additions, though not entitled to be regarded as part of the original Aramaic Gospel, are yet entitled to very high regard, because Jerusalem was a place where the Church must frequently have had the advantage of hearing the Gospel told by men who had either themselves been original witnesses of the facts, or who had companied with those who had been so. To me it seems that Matthew xvi. 17 fits so admirably with the occasion that it may be accepted as undoubtedly an authentic tradition. I can well believe that the two following verses were also spoken by our Lord, though I can admit the possibility that they were not spoken on the same occasion; or, again, that the Evangelist here applies to Peter alone what had been spoken generally of all the Apostles.

There were two lessons which the disciples had needed to be taught. The first was that Jesus was the promised Messiah, a doctrine which could only have excited derision if communicated to unprepared ears. He waited, therefore, until He saw that His hearers were fully ripe for it, but even so He charged them not to publish indiscriminately the announcement which He had authorised.

But among His own disciples there were some who had not only already in their minds anticipated what He now authorised them to claim for Him, but in

their speculations had got beyond all that He had any intention of then communicating to them. They made no doubt but that if He claimed the throne of David He must immediately be seated on it, and they were disputing among themselves to whom the dignities of the coming kingdom were to be awarded. It is plain that the disciples did not understand our Lord's words addressed to Peter as constituting him chief and ruler of his brethren, to say nothing about the government of the whole Church; for the dispute as to who should be the greatest in His kingdom went on, and was still raging the very night before the Crucifixion, when our Lord declined to determine in favour of any of them. Instead, He proceeded to prepare their minds for the second lesson He had to teach them, namely, that the kingdom He was founding was not to be one of this world; and that, though they were right in believing Him to be the Messiah, He was not to be a victorious conqueror, but one despised and rejected of men.

THE FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE PASSION AND THE REBUKE TO PETER

MARK viii. 31.

Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι·

MARK viii. 32, 33.

Καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἔλάλει. καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει, Ὑπαγέθλισω μου, Σατανᾶ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

MATT. xvi. 21.

Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.

MATT. xvi. 22, 23.

Καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ λέγων, Ἰεσοῦς σοι, κύριε· οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο. ὁ δὲ στραφεὶς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· σκάνδαλον εἰ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

LUKE ix. 22.

Εἰπὼν ὅτι Δεῖ τὸν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.

Some commentators who have very correctly called the discourse which we are considering "The first announcement of the Passion" do not in my opinion speak with equal correctness when they describe the announcement reported in St Mark's next chapter as the second. What I think we have to understand here is that this announcement of our Lord's rejection and sufferings was but the first of a series of similar announcements; and in like manner that Peter's refusal to accept such an idea as possible was but the first of a series of like remonstrances. It may then be that our Lord's rebuke (which Luke omits) of the disciple whose keen perception of the truth had just been acknowledged with so high commendation, was not uttered on the first occasion, when sincere attachment to his Master led him to repudiate an idea which he deemed to be unworthy of Him, but afterwards, when he persisted in this repudiation notwithstanding our Lord's assurances of the truth which he was rejecting.

When Peter's confession was made, the Apostles were all together when, our Lord having asked them *Who say ye that I am?* Peter answered on behalf of the rest; and probably received at once, in the words reported by St Matthew, his Master's assurance that he had answered rightly. But on the occasion of this rebuke Peter was alone in conference with our Lord. We are told that Peter took Him (*προσλαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν*), by which I understand that he drew Him aside in order to remonstrate with Him privately on the discouraging language He was using. Possibly he joined himself to our Lord Who was walking in front, or else he was deputed by other Apostles who were watching the result of the conference. For we are told that our Lord turned and saw the other disciples, and then in their hearing rebuked His too eager adherent. And St Mark goes on to tell in verse 34 how He presently repeated to the multitude the lessons for the Apostles which this incident suggested.

The disciples' conviction of the certainty of their

Master's triumph had now become too strong to be shaken by His own warnings of defeat. Not the least of our Saviour's trials must have been the want of sympathy of His chosen companions. To ourselves nothing is more trying than, when we see clear symptoms of approaching calamity, to hear our apprehensions brushed away by the light-hearted assurances of thoughtless friends that fears are groundless which they will not give themselves the trouble to consider.

I think that what the Fourth Evangelist (vii. 3-5) reports of the language used by our Lord's brethren exactly represents to us the course of action to which Peter was urging Him, *If thou doest these things, manifest thyself to the world*. He was pressing Him to go to Jerusalem, and by the wonders there exhibited compel the allegiance of the nation. When our Lord saw that the time had come for accepting the acknowledgment of Himself as the Messiah, the time had also come for making known to His followers His decision as to their demand that He should make a public appearance in Jerusalem. He would go up to Jerusalem, but He would not allow them to be under any delusion as to the result. He would go up, not to be acclaimed as one about to be the successful founder of a temporal kingdom, but to suffer an ignominious death. Nevertheless this death was not to be the end; after three days He should rise again.

Though our Lord repeated this announcement several times, He did not conquer the obstinate incredulity of disciples too strongly convinced of His power to admit the possibility of His failing to enforce acknowledgment of His claims. As they could not imagine that His enemies could succeed in putting Him to death, it followed that they could not understand what He meant by speaking of a resurrection; and, as St Mark tells us a little further on (ix. 10), *questioned among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean*. But afterwards, when the fact of His death became a certainty, and they learnt that

their Master's body was not in the tomb where it had been laid, then former announcements of His came to their mind with new force, and they were prepared to receive the conviction that He had, in the most literal sense, risen from the dead.

THE CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP

MARK viii. 34-37.

Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον κερδῆσαι τὸν κόσμον ὅλον καὶ ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; τί γὰρ δοῖ ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;

MATT. xvi. 24-26.

Τότε [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν. τί γὰρ ὠφεληθήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδῇσῃ τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;

LUKE ix. 23-25.

Ἐλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας, Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος κερδῆσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθεῖς;

We learn from Mark that this section was part of the public teaching of our Lord. What precedes was, from the nature of the case, addressed only to the company of His intimate disciples. He forbade them to publish His acceptance of the title of Messiah; and so it is evident that strangers were not in the company when He assured His Apostles that in thus thinking of Him they had judged rightly. Evidently also it was only those who acknowledged Him as the Messiah who needed to be forewarned how different His career was to be from that of the expected deliverer of the nation. But to those who were outside His inner circle He repeats what had been part of His public teaching elsewhere, that those who would join Him

must follow Him in abandoning every idea of personal exaltation and in forsaking all self-seeking and self-pleasing.

A question arises of whom consisted this ὄχλος which He here addressed. We might have imagined that His question to the Apostles was put, as is a discourse recorded in Mark's next chapter, while they were walking in the way; or, as St Luke tells the story, when, having been engaged in solitary prayer, He was afterwards joined by His Apostles. In that case we must suppose this conversation with the Apostles to have suggested the topic of His next public address. But Mark's προσκαλεσάμενος rather suggests that the multitude here addressed had been in the background all the time. And there is no difficulty in conceiving this. Our Lord no doubt continued His work of teaching in the northern district which He was now visiting, and His steps would naturally be followed by many: some desirous to learn from Him, and others besides from curiosity and a wish to witness some of His works of healing. Another explanation might have been given, namely, that it was only a few of the more ardent expectants of a temporal kingdom, who, having made Peter their spokesman, followed close behind to hear the result of his remonstrance, and that the ὄχλος merely consisted of the other Apostles, and possibly of women who accompanied them. But St Mark is express in stating that in these concluding words our Lord addressed τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

It will be well to compare this section of St Mark's Gospel with other passages where our Lord taught the same lesson, that adherence to Him meant not worldly advancement, but the sacrifice of much in which, according to the world's estimation, happiness consists. In St Matthew's Gospel the closest parallel to the present passage occurs in our Lord's address when sending out the Twelve (Matt. x. 37-39).

Ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος· καὶ ὁ φιλῶν υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος· καὶ ὁ οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος. ὁ εὐρῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν.

I conclude that this passage must have corresponded to something in Q, but in the present passage it seems to me that St Matthew is copying Mark, though with some abridgment, as he takes no notice that the words in this little section were addressed to a different audience from those preceding. St Luke, on the other hand, shows some acquaintance with Mark, for he tells (ix. 23) that this discourse of our Lord was delivered *πρὸς πάντας*; and in xiv. 25-27, where he records the same lessons, he tells that it was delivered to many crowds collected together.

Συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς με καὶ οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ τὰς ἀδελφάς, ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής. ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής.

I may join with this passage, as showing that our Lord taught the same lesson on different occasions, Luke xvii. 33, where the wording is quite different but the idea the same.

Ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὁς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει ζωγονήσῃ αὐτήν.

But to return to the passage in Luke xiv. It is clear that the Evangelist is here making use of an informant different from either Mark or Q; for what he goes on to say in the following verses about *counting the cost* is so luminous a commentary on our Lord's warnings to those who in desiring to join Him seemed prompted by the hope of worldly advantage that I cannot doubt its authenticity. And the place to which St Matthew assigns this saying is probably the earliest when it was used, namely, when He called on His Apostles to give up all and devote themselves to His work. It would be natural that our Lord should recall this warning to

their minds now when He saw them still eager for high places in this world. There may be a trace of the original of this saying in the phrase which all three Evangelists record Him as using on this occasion, *εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν (ἔρχεσθαι, Luke)*, this phrase *following after me* being that used in the calling of the Apostles. These opening words may be but a recalling to the memory of the Apostles the conditions of service to which they had been first invited. But there follow words more especially addressed *πρὸς πάντας*; not only to enthusiastic adherents, eager to enlist in a cause which seemed to them to offer prospects of great worldly advantage, and who needed to be warned that self-sacrifice, not self-assertion, was to be the rule of the new kingdom.

But at the period of our Lord's ministry, which we have now reached, a different lesson had to be taught. There seem to have been many then who fully understood the penalties which the profession of discipleship to Jesus would entail, and who, though fully convinced of the validity of His claims, were, on account of these penalties, deterred from professing their conviction. It was necessary that such persons should be made to know that though His kingdom had indeed its rewards to offer, these rewards could not be obtained by any who strove to serve two masters, and to combine inward belief in Christ with outward allegiance to the world.

MARK viii. 38.

*Ὁς γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται αὐτὸν ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων.

MATT. xvi. 27.

Μέλλει γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ, καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ,

LUKE ix. 26.

*Ὁς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων.

It will be observed that St Matthew's version of this saying is on different lines from that of St Mark or of St Luke, who here adheres closely to Mark. The reason probably is that St Matthew had given already

a much closer parallel to the present saying in his report of our Lord's charge on sending out the Twelve Apostles, in which, as it seems to me, this Evangelist has incorporated some other sayings of our Lord delivered on different occasions.

MATT. x. 32, 33.

Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ὅστις δὲ ἀρνήσεται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

This passage has also a double recognition by St Luke; for in addition to the parallel in the passage now under consideration, ix. 26, there is another in xii. 8, 9, in a discourse having close affinity with that cited from Matt. x.

LUKE xii. 8, 9.

Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἀν ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ.

I think we may conclude that our Lord gave this warning on at least two occasions; and that it produced an impression may be gathered from what I consider a plain reference to it by St Paul, 2 Tim. ii. 12, *If we shall deny him, he also will deny us.*

It seems to me a note of the early date of this utterance of our Lord, that what those who were disposed to follow Him are represented as repelled by is shame rather than suffering, rather the discredit of adherence to the belief of the unlearned and superstitious people, than penalties inflicted for a profession.

Possibly it may be fanciful of me to think that the phrase of taking up and bearing one's cross has reference rather to the disgrace than the pain. It would be natural to think that there was some reference to our Lord's own approaching crucifixion, of which His followers were warned they must be in some sense partakers; yet this bearing of His cross is exactly the part of His suffering

which the Gospels do not record Him as undergoing. It would seem to have been a popular phrase, but I find no historic proof of its having been used. I fear that crucifixion was too common a punishment in those days to attract the people of the city to go outside the walls to see it; but they might constantly see those condemned to it passing through the streets from the judgment hall to the place of execution bearing the cross on which they were to suffer.

It appears from what has been said that St Matthew used a source other than Mark; and if I call it Q, it is without assuming that it was the same source as that to which I have ascribed other passages common to Matthew and Luke, but not found in Mark. The question however that arises is, Did not these two Evangelists also use Mark? I should answer without hesitation that they did, but my chief difficulty arises from the fact that neither of them uses a phrase of Mark's in which it seems to me strange that they should not have followed him. We must especially take notice of the addition which, in verse 35, St Mark makes to the saying as reported by the other Evangelists: *Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it.* I have already observed that the use of the word *gospel* in this technical sense is peculiar to Mark. Its omission in the present passage both by St Matthew and St Luke I count as an indication that the word did not occur here in the common authority which all three Evangelists used, and which I take to be St Matthew's Aramaic Gospel.

INTRODUCTION TO THE TRANSFIGURATION

MARK ix. 1.

Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ἄ-
μην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσὶν
τινες ὧδε τῶν ἐστηκότων
οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται
θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν
βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυ-
θῆσαν ἐν δυνάμει.

MATT. xvi. 28.

Ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰ-
σὶν τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστῶτων
οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται
θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν
υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχό-
μενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐ-
τοῦ.

LUKE ix. 27.

Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς,
εἰσὶν τινες τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐστη-
κότων οἱ οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται
θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν
βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

The first verse of Mark ix. being separated from what precedes by a *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, we are not obliged to regard it as part of the same discourse. That it appears so both in Matthew and Luke might be explained by their both having followed Mark. My own opinion is that though we are not bound to consider the present verse as part of the discourse in Cæsarea Philippi, yet that no great length of time could have separated the two utterances. In all three Gospels this story is immediately followed by that of the Transfiguration; and though this does not bind us in our interpretation of the verse we are considering, yet it does not seem accidental that the story of the Transfiguration should be prefaced by this section.

I do not count it a difficulty, that the length of the interval between these two sections is given by St Matthew and St Mark as six days, and by St Luke as eight; for I count this difference as rather a confirmation of the truth of the history. The epoch of the Transfiguration is defined by reference to a previous discourse of our Lord's; and that discourse in which He accepted the title of Messiah might well have been considered by His disciples as marking an epoch from which other events might be reckoned. The difference of computation between the eight days and the six is easily reconcilable by the supposition that in the one case the interval was computed from that epoch-making discourse, and in the other from the utterance

two days later, when He announced that some of those present should live to witness the coming of His Kingdom with power.

I think that we must regard St Mark as intimating that the Transfiguration exhibited a foretaste of the glories of the kingdom which was afterwards to be revealed. St Luke's account will also admit of this explanation, but St Matthew's will not. It is not satisfied by any partial or spiritual manifestation of the Kingdom of God, or by anything short of the appearing of the Son of God in visible possession of His Kingdom. This difference between Matthew and Mark being fundamental, that is to say, one which could not have been introduced and cannot be removed by translation, is fatal to any theory of inspiration that obliges us to maintain that the sacred writers have in all cases given us the *ipsissima verba* spoken by our Lord. We must then enquire which version of the two represents the words which He actually spoke; and the solution does not seem to me to be easy. For we are asked to separate two things which our Lord's first hearers did not distinguish. There can be no doubt that He taught them to expect that He should come again with His holy angels in the clouds of heaven, as Daniel had prophesied; and it was only by such a sudden appearance as this that they thought of His Kingdom as to be established, nor had it entered into their minds that it could come in any form by slow and progressive evolution. Consequently if our Lord had said, as St Mark reports Him, that some of those present should live to see His Kingdom come with power, one who reported the saying would not feel that he was making any change in it if he gave it the form which we read in Matthew.

On the other hand, it might be suggested that if our Lord had spoken of His personal appearance as likely to be manifested very speedily, it is conceivable that when in time His followers began to despair of the literal fulfilment of His prediction, it came to be modified into a more ambiguous form. But it seems to me that

such a change could not take place within the limits of time at our disposal. The time of our Lord's coming was not revealed. It was possible, and His first disciples may well have thought it probable, that its manifestation would not be delayed beyond their own lifetime. This was clearly St Paul's state of mind when he wrote 1 Thess. iv. We must go down some time considerably later than this before Christians would have so given up hope of such a manifestation as St Paul expected that they would be under a temptation to alter traditional words in order to make them tolerant of the spiritual interpretation which they now felt themselves constrained to give them. And I do not think we can reasonably bring down the composition of St Mark's Gospel so late as this.

THE TRANSFIGURATION

MARK ix. 2a.

Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἑξ
παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς
τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκω-
βον καὶ Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀνα-
φέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψη-
λὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους.

MATT. xvii. 1.

Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἑξ πα-
ραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν
Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ
Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐ-
τοῦ, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς
εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν.

LUKE ix. 28.

Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς
λόγους τούτους ὥσει ἡμέ-
ραι ὀκτὼ παραλαβὼν
Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ
Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος
προσεύξασθαι.

With respect to the accounts of St Matthew and St Mark, it is impossible to doubt that either one is copying the other, or that both are drawing from a common source. St Luke may have used the same authorities, but, according to his custom, employed them with much greater freedom, and the more so in this case because he appears certainly to have used an independent authority, as I have already inferred from the discrepancy between his account and St Mark's of the interval between the Transfiguration and the previous conversation.

There is also a minor point in which Luke differs from Mark and Matthew, viz., that while these two

speak of James and John, Luke speaks of John and James. It is very intelligible that in the early days of the Church James the elder brother took the lead, and John was chiefly known as the brother of James. In fact when it was found that our Lord's death did not put an end to the society which He had founded, and when His enemies had succeeded in obtaining Herod's alliance in enmity against the infant Church, it seems to have been James the brother of John who was recognised by them as the head to be struck at. Peter would seem to have then held the second place, for after the death of James he was next aimed at. But when St Luke wrote, James had been dead for some time, and John was now prominent among the Apostles, so that to the men of that generation James was best described as having been the brother of John. Perhaps it is not refining too much to find a mark of earlier date in Mark's τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, where James and John are coupled under a single article, while in Matthew the mutual relation between these apostles is not recognised in the same way, and the two brothers appear as jointly dependent on Peter. In another point St Luke's authority must give way to that of St Mark and St Matthew who agree in describing our Lord as having taken His Apostles up *a* high mountain. Luke speaks of Him having led them to *the* mountain. This form of expression is rightly used by the earlier Evangelists when the scene is laid at Capernaum, when a definite mountain is referred to. But St Mark and St Matthew had laid the scene of the discourse immediately preceding in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, and give no hint of a return to Capernaum.

MARK ix. 28, 3.

Καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμ-
προσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ
ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στιλ-
βοντα λευκὰ λίαν ὅλα γνα-
φειὸς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύνα-
ται οὕτως λευκᾶναι.

MATT. xvii. 2.

Καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμ-
προσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμ-
ψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια
αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ
φῶς.

LUKE ix. 29.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσ-
εύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδο-
τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἔτε-
ρον καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ
λευκὸς ἑξαστράπτων.

It is to be noted that while all three Evangelists are here in substantial agreement, the identity of verbal expression which we find between Matthew and Mark in the preceding verse is not continued in this one; so that, as far as the evidence from this verse goes, we should conclude that the Evangelists were not here reproducing a common document, but were recording a story which they had heard from different reporters. St Luke does not here use more than his accustomed liberty of change. I am disposed to conjecture that we have in Matthew the form in which it had been told in Q, and that St Mark has retained some of the vividness of expression in which Peter had related the event.

MARK ix. 4-8.

Καὶ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Ἡλείας σὺν
Μωσεῖ, καὶ ἦσαν συναλοῦντες τῷ
Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέ-
γει τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Ῥαββί, καλὸν ἐστὶν
ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς
σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωσεῖ μίαν καὶ
Ἡλείᾳ μίαν. οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀπο-
κριθῆ, ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο. καὶ
ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς,
καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης,
Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,
ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξάπινα περι-
βλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον μεθ'
ἐαυτῶν εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.

MATT. xvii. 3-8.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Μωυσῆς καὶ
Ἡλείας συναλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ.
ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν τῷ
Ἰησοῦ, Κύριε, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε
εἶναι· εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς
σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωσεῖ μίαν καὶ
Ἡλείᾳ μίαν. ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος
ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐ-
τούς, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης
λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ
ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε
αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ
ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφο-
βήθησαν σφόδρα. καὶ προσήλθεν ὁ
Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν,
Ἐγέρθητε καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε. ἐπά-
ραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν οὐ-
δένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.

The close relation between St Matthew's account and St Mark's is manifest; but it is to be noted that St Mark speaks of a voice from *the cloud*, without having previously told of any cloud. It seems to me that this is best explained by the supposition that St Mark is copying, not Matthew, but the authority whence

St Matthew drew. St Luke's account is so much fuller that I do not set it on a line with the other two.

LUKE ix. 30-36a.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἡλείας, οἱ ὁφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἡμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ· διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἅπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Ἐπιστάτα, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὥδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιῶμεν σκηνὰς τρεῖς, μίαν σοὶ καὶ μίαν Μωϋσεὶ καὶ μίαν Ἡλείᾳ, μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει. ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν νεφέλην. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. καὶ ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὐρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος.

It must be noted that St Matthew and St Luke show their use of a common authority by the employment of words not found in Mark: ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, Matt. xvii. 5; ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, Luke ix. 34.

St Luke alone tells the subject of our Lord's discourse with Moses and Elijah; but though this may have been afterwards told the disciples by our Lord, it is not likely to have been overheard by them in their state of sleep and terror. The three Evangelists agree in the words of Peter's address to our Lord, *Rabbi*, which St Matthew translates κύριε, and St Luke ἐπιστάτα.

καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὥδε εἶναι.—καλὸν ἐστὶν is a favourite phrase with St Mark (see vii. 27; ix. 42, 43, 45, 47; xiv. 21); and the other Evangelists may have merely copied Mark. It is needless to speculate what exactly Peter meant; for we are told that he himself did not know. Nothing is more common than for one awakening suddenly from sleep to catch himself saying words, having reference no doubt to something which had occupied his thoughts in sleep, but of which he could himself give no explanation.

St Matthew brings the words of the voice from heaven into coincidence with that at the Baptism by adding ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. St Luke, instead of ἀγαπητός

has, according to the older copies, ἐκλελεγμένος; and certainly if this had not been the original reading it is not easy to see why it should have been introduced; while it is quite conceivable that the converse change should be made in order to bring St Luke's account into fuller agreement with that of the other Evangelists.

THE DESCENT FROM THE MOUNT

MARK ix. 9-13.

MATT. xvii. 9-13.

LUKE ix. 36*b*, 37*a*.

When the disciples spoke to our Lord of what they had seen, He at once silenced them and commanded them to tell no man until after He had risen from the dead. St Luke mentions that they thus kept silence, but does not tell that it was in obedience to their Master's command. We may conclude that it was not until after our Lord's death that the story of the Transfiguration became known to any but the three who had witnessed it.

It is quite natural that just at this moment the disciples should quote the doctrine of the Pharisees that Elijah must come before the appearance of the Messiah. It was but a short time before that they had received their Master's sanction for thinking of Him as the promised Messiah; and they had no doubt made known to the Scribes and Pharisees this belief of theirs. And then they were encountered by the objection that they must be mistaken in supposing that Christ had already come, seeing that there had as yet been no sign of the Elijah who was to precede Him. In other words, my view is that it was not so much that the disciples had known this as a common article of Pharisaic belief, as that their attention had been drawn to it through its being urged against them as a disproof of the dignity which they had ascribed to their Master. It ought to have been a sufficient

answer to the Pharisees that the same prophecy which told of Elijah also predicted that the Israelites were to be again ruled by David their king. It is not more forced an interpretation to understand the one prophecy as meaning one in the spirit and with the power of Elijah, than to understand the other as a descendant of David with like power and authority.

It is remarkable that St Luke, who is here copying Mark, omits altogether the question about Elijah; and the explanation is that he wrote for a different circle of readers from those for whom the other two Gospels were intended. The Gentile Christians had no special interest in the Baptist, of whose name they had never heard until it became known to them from the prominence it bore in the biography of Jesus. Nor were they so familiar with the Old Testament prophets as to be much troubled by the difficulty raised by the Pharisees that the coming of Elijah must precede the coming of the Messiah. So St Luke could omit the discussion of a difficulty which his readers did not feel, and for the solution of which they would not care; and could thus make room for other things more suited to their wants.

THE HEALING OF THE EPILEPTIC DEMONIAK

MARK ix. 14-19.

MATT. xvii. 14-17.

LUKE ix. 37b-41.

There is no part of St Mark's Gospel in which we can more clearly trace indebtedness to St Peter than in all this section about the Transfiguration. Our Lord had enjoined on the witnesses of the scene to tell no man until after His resurrection, so it was not from Him that the Church derived its knowledge of it; and of the three witnesses to it, if we naturally think of Peter, our suspicion is confirmed by the account of the words spoken on the occasion by Peter, the exact

meaning of which he himself could not explain. Then we have an account of the conversation between our Lord and the disciples as they were descending; and now we have a story told altogether from the point of view of the returning disciples. They catch sight of a crowd thronging about the nine disciples who had remained behind, and the scribes questioning with them. Then when the crowd catches sight of our Lord they run to meet Him; and then when our Lord enquires the subject of the discussion, one of the multitude tells of his family affliction and how he had sought help from the disciples in vain.

Though St Matthew has a good deal in common with Mark, there is evidence of his use of a different authority, sufficient to convince us that this story had been told in Q. Indeed, the account of this miracle is closely connected by all our authorities with the story of the Transfiguration, which could scarcely have been absent from Q. Among the differences between Matthew and Mark we must notice that while St Mark represents the man as speaking in answer to a question from our Lord, both Matthew and Luke would lead us to think of him as rushing up, without any encouragement, to make his appeal. But the most important difference is that while St Mark ascribes the boy's sufferings to demoniacal possession, St Matthew says nothing about a demoniac, but describes the boy as an epileptic; and the point chiefly demanding attention here is that St Matthew in his description makes no mention of demoniacal possession, an omission which could scarcely have taken place if he had learnt his story from Mark.

It may be noted that there is the ordinary sign of the use of Q, viz., the agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark. To Mark's *ὁ γενεὰ ἄπιστος* the other two Evangelists agree in adding *καὶ διεστραμμένη*. They also agree in having *ὧδε* instead of *πρός με*, in the direction to the father to bring his son. That St Luke was also acquainted with Q, must, I think,

rest principally on the use of this *διεστραμμένη*. I lay little stress on the *καὶ ἰδοὺ* which Weiss regards as an infallible mark of Aramaic origin (see *supra*, p. 335).

There being reason to believe that St Mark gives us the testimony of an eye-witness, we are not surprised that he gives us in fuller detail than the others our Lord's conversation with the man who sought His assistance.

MARK ix. 20-24.

St Matthew appears to have utilised this passage of Mark, but has put this falling into fire and into water into the previous description.

MARK ix. 25.

Demoniac possession manifested itself in two ways. In the one case the symptoms were such as show themselves in what we call lunacy: loud, unreasonable speech, uncontrollable gestures, violent actions. In the other case, such as we class under the head of epilepsy: convulsive fits in which the patient neither speaks nor seems capable of understanding any address made to him. Thus we understand why this demon is addressed as *τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα*. It was evidently easy, in comparison, to treat cases such as the disciples had already found themselves competent to deal with, where the patients, however rude or even blasphemous in their language, and however violent in their actions, yet showed so much rationality as to be capable of being addressed, and of recognising an authority superior to themselves, so that when addressed in a voice of mild command they yielded and obeyed. But dealing with these epileptics was like a struggle with the blind forces of nature. This man, whose intellect was probably little developed, when in one of his fits was not capable of conversation, and in the intervals between them neither acknowledged Jesus as the Son of David, nor repelled Him by contumelious reception. No voice that he uttered

could be taken as the language of the demon. And he was as deaf as he was dumb. Exorcism and adjuration were spent on him in vain.

MARK ix. 26, 27.

Καὶ κράζας καὶ πολλὰ
σπαράζας ἐξῆλθεν· καὶ
ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρὸς ὥστε
τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι
ἀπέθανεν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ
ῥήγειρεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀνέστη.

MATT. xvii. 18.

Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ
Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ'
αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον· καὶ
ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ
τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.

LUKE ix. 42, 43a.

Ἐπὶ δὲ προσερχομένου
αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ
δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπά-
ραξεν· ἐπετίμησεν δὲ ὁ
Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ
ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἴασατο τὸν
παῖδα καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν
τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. ἐξεπλήσ-
σοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ
μεγαλειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ.

What is remarkable about St Matthew's narrative is that, as already noted, he describes the boy's illness entirely as a case of disease, without any mention of a demon. This is capable of sufficient explanation on the supposition that the Apostle Matthew was the author. He only belonged to the outer circle of the disciples; and as he was not one of the three who were close enough to hear the father's relation of the case, his personal observation only supplied him with a knowledge of the outward symptoms. But here at the end, St Matthew for the first time recognises it as a case of demoniacal possession, and tells that the demon went out from him.

It seems to me that the most probable explanation of this phenomenon is to regard St Matthew's account as in the main founded on the Aramaic Matthew, and to acknowledge that the Gospel received its Greek form from one who was acquainted with St Mark's Gospel. He uses Mark's word *ἐπετίμησεν*, and appears to have derived from Mark the detail of falling sometimes into the fire, sometimes into the water.

I cannot help thinking that it was this narrative which inspired the Fourth Evangelist in his narration of the cure of the man who was born blind. I consider that this last Evangelist had a strong sense of dramatic propriety which I do not believe to have existed in St Mark to such a degree as to make him capable of inventing a story.

THE CAUSE OF THE DISCIPLES' ILL SUCCESS

MARK ix. 28, 29.

Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν, "Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ [καὶ νηστείᾳ].

MATT. xvii. 19-21.

Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπαν, Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Διὰ τὴν ὀλιγοπιστίαν ὑμῶν· ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τοῦτω, Μετάβα ἐνθεν ἐκεῖ, καὶ μεταβήσεται, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσῃ ὑμῖν. [τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται, εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ.]

This question and its answer are absent from Luke; and it is plain also that they were derived by St Matthew from Mark. In fact St Matthew closes his history of the miracle with the words ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης, and immediately before, the complaint of the applicant to our Lord is *I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι*. We should therefore expect the question of the disciples to have been, Why could not we θεραπεῦσαι? but although St Matthew had not until verse 18 made any mention of a demon, the question now is, *Why could not we cast it out?* It seems to me that the evidence here is irresistible of St Matthew's use of a double source, namely, the authority which I call Q, in which there was no mention of demoniac possession, and St Mark's Gospel, which ascribes the whole illness to the work of a demon.

In my opinion there is evidence of conflation in St Matthew's version of our Lord's answer when asked to explain the ill success of His disciples, who had been given by Him authority to cast out demons and had been taught by His example how to do so. I take it that St Matthew has reported to us the answer given by Q, namely, that it was because of their weakness of belief that they could not *cure the disease*, though

I am bound to acknowledge the possibility that the Evangelists might have fitted into this place an answer which we know our Lord to have given on other occasions, see Matt. xxi. 21; Luke xvii. 6.

Mark ix. 29 has great difficulties, both of criticism and of exegesis, which cannot be separated from each other; and both are so closely connected with the subject of this essay, namely, the investigation of the sources used by the Evangelists, that I cannot turn aside from the discussion of them.

A very brief statement will suffice as to the critical questions at issue. First as to the reading of Mark. Our Lord's answer is given by the overpowering majority of the MSS. in the words, *This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer and fasting*; but the words *and fasting* are omitted by two Greek MSS. and also by one Latin one of high authority. So feebly supported dissent might be easily set aside if it were not that the two Greek MSS. referred to are the oldest that we have, viz., the Vatican and the Sinaitic. Still we cannot permit any authority so to tyrannise over us as to compel us to accept any reading which, when we try to interpret it, will not yield some tolerable sense. But before we proceed to internal evidence we have to ask, What light is thrown on the question at issue by Matthew, this verse being found in the majority of the copies of the First as well as of the Second Gospel? And to this question we get an answer with unexpected unanimity. Every MS. of Matthew which contains this verse at all includes the words *καὶ νηστεία*. It cannot plausibly be maintained that the insertion of *καὶ νηστεία* was made from Matthew into Mark, because those witnesses which do not acknowledge the words as genuine do not admit this verse into Matthew at all. It remains then that these words came into Matthew from Mark. But why should we suppose that they were inserted only by the transcribers of the First Gospel? for now that we have learnt what use the Evangelist himself made of Mark there is nothing to forbid us to believe that this

Evangelist already found the words in his copy of the Second Gospel; and if so the date of their insertion must have been very early.

But the strongest reason for adhering to the Received Text here is that the omission of the words *καὶ νηστεία* leads to most unnatural exegesis.

Of those critics who reject the words *καὶ νηστεία*, the majority suppose that by *this kind*, in our Lord's answer, He is making a distinction between the casting out of demons and the treatment of ordinary diseases; certain conditions being demanded in the former case which are not needed for other cures. But in the whole story there is no mention of any kind of disease but the one; and both the disciples question *Why could not we cast it out?* and our Lord's answer, *This kind goeth not forth or is not cast out*, clearly refers only to the expulsion of a demon. It is violent forcing to interpret the words *this kind* in any other way than *this kind of demon*, a sense which precisely fits the context. For the symptoms in this case were totally different from what was manifested in ordinary cases of demoniac possession, namely, inarticulate convulsive struggles such as show themselves in cases of what we now call epilepsy. The demon which excited them was *ἄλαλον καὶ κωφόν*, apparently incapable of hearing the voice of command or of making any reply. It might well be that conditions of treatment were demanded for demons of this kind which were not needful in ordinary cases. But by whom were these conditions to be fulfilled? By the exorcists? or by the patient? Considering that it was the same patient whom our Lord had cured and the disciples could not, it would be natural to think that the difference lay in the qualifications of the exorciser, and the disciples must acknowledge that however closely they had imitated the proceedings of their Master, they had not imitated His training. Though He did not make fasting obligatory on them, He had practised it Himself, and had commenced His ministry with a fast of forty days; and He could spend whole nights in prayer.

Those, however, who do not retain the words *καὶ νηστεία* in Mark's text find it difficult to explain the saying *This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer*. The Pharisees had complained that our Lord's disciples did not fast; but could it be said, they did not pray? and was their failure to cure this demoniac to be accounted for by their not having prayed long or earnestly enough? In order to get over this difficulty the conditions are interpreted as needing to be fulfilled, not by the exorcist, but by the patient. The explanation given of this requirement is that the applicant for help must show the faith which in other passages is described as essential to a cure, by believing prayer for assistance. In short, though prayer is what is expressed, it is really only faith that is meant. But here we have to return to the words *this kind*, which seem to make the prayer here spoken of as only necessary in the case of one kind of need. Was it only for the casting out of devils that such faith was demanded? Our Lord did try to elicit it in the case of the father of this demoniac. But so He did in other cases too. In the first place in which St Matthew records such a demand, it was not in the case of the expulsion of a demon, but of a cure of blindness, that our Lord put the question *Believe ye that I am able to do this?* (Matt. ix. 28). It is evident that if *καὶ νηστεία* was read in the text, this condition could not be understood as applying to the patient. It is not specified what length of fasting was required, nor is enquiry ever said to have been made whether the sufferer had fasted. In the case of a child such fasting would not be expected; and even the condition of faith was not required of the child, but of the parents who solicited the Saviour's help. That such vicarious faith would be accepted it is reasonable to believe, but it is not so easy to believe in the efficacy of vicarious fasting.

I have already said that *καὶ νηστεία* must have been very early in the text of Mark; for the author, or editor, of St Matthew's Gospel, as it appears in the great

majority of copies, must have found it in his text of Mark. I must now add that the omission of the words must have been very early too; for the agreement of B and \aleph is enough to prove that this was a case of deliberate omission. And whose interest was it to leave it out? The Christian Church practised fasting from the very time of their Master's departure. We may conclude, then, that hesitation to acknowledge fasting as conferring any special powers or privileges indicates a time or place when controversy with the Pharisees on this subject was still alive. We can understand, then, why the saying which St Mark has preserved for us found no place in that earlier attempt to record such sayings which I have called Q.

THE CONTINUED ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE PASSION

MARK ix. 30-32.

MATT xvii. 22, 23.

LUKE ix. 43b-45.

In my first draft of these notes I had followed the example of some preceding commentators in entitling this section "Our Lord's second announcement of His Passion." It is no doubt the second announcement that St Mark records; but there is no reason to suppose that St Mark meant to record all, nor have we reason to think that the announcement here recorded was only the second. What the Evangelists agree in telling us is that our Lord's first announcement of His Passion was made at the time when He saw fit to assure His disciples that they were right in judging Him to be the promised Messiah. Then He found it necessary to teach them that His Messiahship was not to be one of victory, and possession of temporal power, but of suffering and humiliation. Both St Matthew and St Mark say that He then *began* to teach them these things; and we need not doubt that from that time it

came to be a frequent topic in His conversation. St Luke tells us that His Passion was the subject on which He conversed with Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration. Either our Lord must have Himself told this to His disciples, or the tradition got into circulation among them because this subject had at the time become so prominent a topic of His discourses with them that they judged He must have spoken of it then.

As for the scene of the Transfiguration, St Mark consistently places it outside Galilee, and now (verse 30) makes our Lord return through Galilee, and continue His journey till He arrives at Capernaum. St Matthew says nothing to contradict this inference from Mark, though it is not so distinctly suggested by his own account. All through this part of our Lord's course He seems desirous to avoid attracting the notice of the authorities, a concealment which would have been impossible in a place where He was so well known as Capernaum. He fully knew the desire of His enemies to put Him to death, but He knew also that Jerusalem, not Galilee, must be the scene of His sufferings (Luke xiii. 33).

In the passages now under consideration, all agree in declaring that our Lord should be *delivered up into the hands of men*. I understand the *παράδοται* here as denoting the Father's giving up His Son into the hands of men. In this section Luke differs from the other two in making no mention of our Lord's resurrection. We must here give the preference to the story as told by St Matthew and St Mark; for a belief in the resurrection could scarcely have been so quickly and so easily established if our Lord had not predicted it in His lifetime. St Luke's silence here raises a doubt whether he could have used St Mark's account (ix. 10) that it was the mention of the resurrection which the disciples found most difficult to understand. However contrary to their expectation it might be that our Lord should be made prisoner and slain, yet a prediction to

that purpose would be perfectly intelligible. The hypothesis then suggests itself that St Luke is using, not Mark, but Q, which had concluded the prediction with the words common to all the Evangelists, *delivered up into the hands of men*, and that Q had also then stated that the disciples were afraid to ask the meaning of the saying. St Matthew would seem unable to explain how they could fail to understand, and merely says that they were much grieved. St Luke explains their inability to understand as the result of a divine hiding from them of the meaning of the prophecy. Both here and in the history of the Transfiguration, Q gives me the idea of having been written by an eye-witness, but not by one of the favoured three who had been admitted to intimate knowledge of our Lord's sayings.

THE DISPUTE ABOUT PRECEDENCE

MARK ix. 33-37.

MATT xviii. 1-5.

LUKE ix. 46-48; xxii. 24-26.

We must notice here the continuity of St Mark's narrative. He had placed the scene of the Transfiguration in the North; he tells what teaching our Lord gave His disciples on their return to the lake of Gennesaret; now he records their arrival at Capernaum; then, when our Lord has His disciples in private, he takes notice of disputes between them, which had occurred on their journey.

There is every reason to suppose that the dispute took place between the three disciples who had been present at the Transfiguration, and who had been the most intimate companions of Jesus on the journey. The subsequent history of the Church proves that Peter had some reason to think himself the chief of the Apostles. The incident which St Mark presently relates makes us aware of the rival claims of James and John, who had

been joined with Peter on more than one occasion when three disciples were admitted to be present at scenes from which the other Apostles were excluded.

It appears from St Mark's narrative that our Lord's question concerning the subject which His disciples had been discussing among themselves was not addressed to the whole body of them ; for the Evangelist, having recorded what our Lord said to the parties in the dispute, goes on to relate that He then seated Himself in the attitude of a teacher, and summoned the rest of the Twelve to hear the lesson which the incident drew forth.

We may gather from St Matthew's Gospel that nothing was said to the other Apostles about the dispute on the road ; for St Matthew does not mention it, but only tells that a question had been asked our Lord, *Who is greatest in the kingdom of Heaven?* This harmonises well with the tradition that the author of the earliest account of our Lord's life was an Apostle who was not one of the favoured three. The incident of our Lord's setting a child before them was one which could not fail to impress itself on the memory of all who were present ; but St Matthew need have known nothing of the disputes of the Three among themselves. I conclude that this story was told in Q, as it appears in our First Gospel.

The placing of a child before the disciples took place in the house at which our Lord was staying in Capernaum, probably the house of Andrew and Peter. The child was in all probability one of the children of that house ; and probably this was not the first time he had been taken into our Lord's arms.

THE INDEPENDENT EXORCIST

MARK ix. 38-40.

LUKE ix. 49, 50.

This story illustrates the special reputation Jesus had gained as having power over demons ; this being

the one of His supernatural powers which seems to have earliest, and most, impressed His countrymen. Those whom our Lord sent out were authorised to use that Name before which the demons trembled, and they gave their commands in the name of their Master. Thus when the Seventy returned from their mission they were able to report (Luke x. 17), *Even the demons are subject unto us in thy name.* It was the general belief at the time that the success of an exorcist depended altogether on his using the right form of adjuration ; and we learn here that one who had observed the success of the adjuration used by our Lord's envoys, *I command thee in the name of Jesus to come out of him*, conceived that the same formula used by himself would have like efficacy. We find that he used it with success, notwithstanding the repeated attempts (ἐκωλύομεν) to prevent him made by those who had real authority to use that Name. Our Lord, while He does not over-rate the value of the recognition implied by the use of His name, yet does not sympathise with the jealousy of the disciples. *At least*, He tells them, *one who works a miracle in my name will not lightly speak evil of me.* And certainly such a one could not join in the Pharisaic theory of our Lord's success as an exorcist. One who, in casting out a demon, uses the name of Jesus, will not be apt to attribute his own success as due to his having joined in an alliance between Jesus and Beelzebub.

We have in the Acts (xix. 13) an excellent illustration of the incident now under consideration ; for it there appears that Jewish professional exorcists, some time after the death of Jesus, were still using the form of adjuration in His name, the success of which when used by Christians they had often witnessed. Both St Mark and St Luke were members of St Paul's company ; and as such must have frequently heard the story of the disaster which befell the sons of Sceva, and therefore had more interest than St Matthew in recording that this idea of borrowing Christian forms of adjuration had been started in our Lord's lifetime.

St Luke's account is here clearly abridged from St Mark's. He reduces our Lord's answer to the general maxim with which it concludes, *He that is not against us is for us*. This may seem in opposition to another saying of our Lord's recorded in Q (Matt. xii. 30; Luke xi. 23), ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν. It is not without reason that the remark has been made that there is a difference between *against us* and *against me*. John's complaint was, *He followed not us*; that is to say, He is not one of our society, or, as St Luke puts it, *He followeth not with us*; that is to say, He is not a follower of Thee, as we are. But though neutrality may suffice for the success of the cause, it does not suffice for determining whether the man himself is, or is not, to be counted as ranging himself on the side of our Lord's enemies. In the days of persecution, the services of a compassionate heathen might receive such recompense as Christ promised to those who give a cup of cold water to one of His disciples; but yet these services would not suffice to make the donor a Christian, though in some cases they have led to that result.

THE REWARD OF IMPERFECT FAITH

MARK ix. 41.

Ὁς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον
ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ,
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ
τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

MATT. x. 42.

Καὶ ὅς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν
τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς
ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οἱ
μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

This verse which I have just quoted has, undoubtedly, a certain connexion with what St Mark has recorded immediately before; namely, with the maxim enunciated by our Lord, *He that is not against us is for us*; for He might naturally go on to speak of the acknowledgment He was willing to give for even slight services to His cause. Yet I believe that the real connexion is with what our Lord had been saying before John's inter-

ruption. In fact, if the whole of the little section which relates the unauthorised exorcism were cut out, our Lord's discourse would read quite coherently. The impression on my mind is that this whole discourse had been contained in Q; and that St Mark, when he made use of it, inserted from independent information the little anecdote of our Lord's answer to His disciple John, an answer quite in harmony with this discourse.

The passage in Matthew which I have set by the side of Mark ix. 41, as its closest parallel, is found in a different section of Matthew itself; that section being, no doubt, also derived from Q. It is the section in which is recorded the instruction given by our Lord to the Twelve when He was sending them out. It is in a later chapter of Matthew (xviii.) that he uses this section of Mark; but he there omits the verse corresponding to Mark ix. 41, which he had used already. Yet the phrase *these little ones* common to Matt. x. 42 and xviii. 6, 10, gives us reason to think that both verses belong to the same discourse which had been recorded in Q, and of which we have a fuller account in Matthew than that with which St Mark has contented himself.

But the verse in Mark (ix. 41) presents a difficulty, at least if we adopt the reading attested by the authorities which in other cases I regard as best entitled to confidence. The rival readings are—

Textus Receptus, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ.

Westcott and Hort, ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ.

Matt. x. 42, εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ.

Here the first reading is condemned not only by the absence of τῷ and of μου from the oldest copies, but also by the fact that it is too clear to give occasion for the use of any rival reading; whereas ἐν ὀνόματι certainly seems to require some supplement to make it intelligible, though we can easily conceive that the author himself did not think it necessary to repeat at full length the ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, which he had used in his account of our Lord's discourse immediately before John's interruption.

But the chief difficulty is in the phrase ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ, the genuineness of which is not disputed, but which varies in its wording from St Mark's ordinary practice. To ourselves the name *Christ* has become as much a proper name as Jesus, so that few modern readers notice the anomaly on which I am now obliged to comment. The context seems to require the sense to be that our Lord is willing to acknowledge and requite the very smallest service, even though no more than giving a cup of cold water, if done for His sake. There would have been no difficulty if the Evangelist had written, *If any give you to drink a cup of cold water because you belong to ME*; but when he says, *because you belong to CHRIST*, he seems to make our Lord demand an acknowledgment of His Messiahship, for which at the time the Apostles themselves were scarcely ripe. Thus the idea suggests itself that the introduction here of the name *Christ* is an anachronism, and that the Evangelist is expressing himself in his own language, and not repeating the words actually used by Jesus.

The use of the word *Christ* as a proper name came in so very early that there would be nothing surprising in St Mark's form of expression if it were not that this Evangelist has ordinarily taken special pains to speak with strict propriety of language. It was at a comparatively early stage of the Church's progress that a prophet taught the Church of Antioch the name Christian, which assumes the habitual use of the name Christ. Such a use inevitably followed the formation of Gentile churches. The new converts would naturally call the Founder of the religion they were joining by the name which the earlier disciples had used. But untouched as they were by the associations which in Jewish minds were connected with the title Messiah, or its Greek equivalent, Christ, they would be satisfied to know that this was the name by which their Master was to be called, and would not trouble themselves much about its derivation. In fact, being pronounced Chrestiani, it was generally supposed in

Gentile circles to have some affinity with the adjective *χρηστός*. It may be believed that St Mark habitually used the same language as St Paul; and so it is conceivable that though on the grounds of literary propriety he was postponing the introduction of the title Christ, he might, when not on his guard to prevent it, drop back into the use of *Christ* as a proper name, since it conveyed exactly the same idea to most of his readers whether he wrote, *because ye belong to Christ*, or *because ye belong to me*. However, on consideration, and remembering that St Mark had related only a little before that our Lord had authorised His disciples to regard Him as the Christ, I believe that he has made no slip, and that he here uses the name Christ in its highest official sense. This conclusion is confirmed by the parallel discourse in Matt. x. Although our Lord was willing to reward the smallest service done Him, He evidently has not in view such services as men give to their equals in the ordinary intercourse of life, but services rendered in acknowledgment of His own divine character. Matthew (x. 41) has reported His saying that, *He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward*; and St Mark here supplies the climax, that those who receive the followers of Christ shall be regarded as having received Himself, and shall receive the appropriate reward.

OFFENCES

MARK ix. 42.

Καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίῃ
ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων
τῶν πιστευόντων, καλὸν
ἐστὶν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περι-
κεῖται μύλος ὄνικος περὶ
τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ
βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασ-
σαν.

MATT. xviii. 6.

Ὁς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίῃ
ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων
τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ,
συμφέρι αὐτῷ ἵνα κρε-
μασθῇ μύλος ὄνικος περὶ
τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ
καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελά-
γῳ τῆς θαλάσσης.

LUKE xvii. 2.

Λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος
μυλῖκος περίκειται περὶ
τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ
ἐρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίῃ τῶν
μικρῶν τούτων ἓνα.

This verse of Mark is a fitting complement to the preceding verse, ix. 41 ; for it was natural that our Lord having spoken of the rewards due to those who for His sake did His disciples a service, should go on to speak of the penalties to those who did them an injury. St Matthew's version and St Mark's have no variations greater than might arise in different translations of the same original ; but St Luke, though retaining some of Mark's words, yet has evidently recast the sentence for himself. The verbal differences are not sufficient to disprove the supposition that all three Evangelists used a discourse which had previously been recorded by Q. Instead of Matthew's *συμφέρει*, St Mark has his favourite *καλόν ἐστιν*. St Luke, who in his use of Q often gives me the impression of one not copying what he has read, but of one repeating from memory what he has heard, here has *λυσitteλει*, and has other verbal variations from Mark. Mark's *μύλος ὀγκός*, the upper millstone, is probably original, for which St Luke substitutes the more generally intelligible *λίθος μυλικός*.

St Mark now proceeds with verses 43-50, which seem to have little connexion with the previous discourse, and might be thought to have been suggested to the Evangelist by the occurrence of the verb *σκανδαλίζω* in what precedes. But if, as I have suggested, the previous words are taken from Q, we need not be surprised if St Mark makes still further use of the same source. We cannot doubt that St Mark found in Q the section next following, for the words with which St Matthew introduces it have corresponding words in Luke.

MATT. xviii. 7.

Οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδά-
λων· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα,
πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι' οὗ τὸ σκάν-
δαλον ἔρχεται.

LUKE xvii. 1.

Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ,
Ἐνέδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα
μὴ ἐλθεῖν, πλὴν οὐαὶ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται·

St Luke does not use the word *σκάνδαλα* except when there is reason to think he is copying Q.

MARK ix. 43-48.

Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ σε ἡ χεὶρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλὸν ἐστὶν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον. καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίσῃ σε, ἀπόκοψον αὐτόν· καλὸν ἐστὶν σε εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν. καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίσῃ σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· καλὸν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς γέενναν, ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται·

MATT. xviii. 8, 9.

Εἰ δὲ ἡ χεὶρ σου ἢ ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίσῃ σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτόν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλὸν σοὶ ἐστὶν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν κυλλὸν ἢ χωλόν, ἢ δύο χεῖρας ἢ δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον. καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίσῃ σε, ἔξελε αὐτόν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλὸν σοὶ ἐστὶν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

In this it is impossible to doubt that St Matthew has copied Mark. He has abridged Mark by compressing into one verse what in Mark had occupied two, but preserving several of Mark's words such as *κυλλόν*, *χωλόν*, *μονόφθαλμον*, and even St Mark's favourite *καλόν ἐστίν*. But that St Matthew is here a copyist is made more clear by the fact that the result is a doublet. In chapter xviii. St Matthew has copied Mark, but in the passage from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 29-30), on which I have already commented, there is, no doubt, a direct use of Q, which we may accept as giving the original form of the saying from which St Mark's version was developed. I own I have my doubts whether the saying about the right eye or the right hand has any proper place in this connexion. In the Sermon on the Mount it has an intelligible connexion with the preceding verse about looking on a woman to lust after her. Here I do not see any connexion, unless St Mark, who has cut out the eunuch verse from Matt. xix., wished to give a non-ascetic sense to this passage. (See *supra*, pp. 125-127.)

MARK ix. 49, 50.

Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται [καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλ' ἁλισθήσεται]. Καλὸν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας ἀναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε; ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα, καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

I am glad that my plan does not oblige me to treat

of the exegesis of the last three verses; for if I must speak the honest truth, the connexion between them seems to be rather of words than of thoughts. The word $\pi\upsilon\rho$ in verse 48 seems to suggest the $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ of verse 49, and that again the precept of the law (Lev. ii. 13), $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (see Ezek. xliii. 24), and then again a precept of our Lord's in which salt is mentioned (elsewhere recorded, Matt. v. 13; Luke xiv. 34). But whatever difficulties there may be in tracing the connexion of verse 49, the admonition (verse 50), *Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another*, comes as a fitting conclusion of words spoken by the Master on the occasion of a dispute concerning precedence between His disciples. He had said, *Ye are the salt of the earth*. But what if the salt had lost its saltiness? That work in the world which they were intended to fulfil could not be accomplished if they failed to preserve their own purity, or allowed their minds to be tainted with earthly ambition.

The connexion in Matthew leads us to think of the offence as given through the discussion on the question of precedence. What our Lord says seems to suggest that the dispute was not confined to the more distinguished apostles, such as Peter, James, and John, who might justly expect to play the leading part, but that some also of those who might be called $\text{o}\acute{\iota}\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}$ asserted their rights in what might seem an arrogant way, and perhaps used insulting words concerning the pretensions of more prominent members of their body. Thus our Lord would be led to speak of the duty of forgiving offences, and of not despising the humbler brethren, who though assigned a lower place on account of irregularities in their previous life, yet by their conversion excited more rejoicing in heaven than was afforded by the gathering in of those who had never gone much astray. It is not a very hard lesson to be taught the duty of forgiving one offence; but the lesson becomes a hard one if the offence is repeated after forgiveness, so that it occurs again and again. This was

where Peter felt the difficulty ; and St Matthew's report is confirmed by St Luke, who immediately after the two verses on offences, xvii. 1, 2, records the injunction, *If thy brother sin . . . against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent ; thou shalt forgive him* (Luke xvii. 3, 4).

In Matthew, the key words which run through the whole of this section are *these little ones*, so that the whole discourse fitly hangs together if made, as St Matthew represents it, on the occasion when our Lord set a little child as a pattern to His disciples. Matthew's opening words are (xviii. 10), *See that ye despise not one of these little ones*.

The critical editors cast out the next verse (Matt. xviii. 11), which certainly lacks the attestation of the oldest authorities. Yet the case for omission does not seem to me to be quite adequately established. It was a genuine utterance of our Lord (see Luke xix. 10), and is quite of the character of the sayings recorded in this context ; but if this saying were included in a document used both by St Matthew and by St Luke, why should St Matthew neglect to utilise it ? I think it is easier to explain omission than insertion. The passage was not inserted in Matthew from Luke, who gives the words differently, adding *to seek*. But the connexion here is so little obvious that the verse might easily have been left out as irrelevant by a critical editor. Yet I think there is a real connexion. We are imperfectly informed as to the circumstances in which Q records that the words now under consideration were spoken. But clearly *οἱ μικροί*, of whom our Lord speaks, were persons whom their brethren were tempted to despise and thus to find in them occasion for stumbling. The person whom our Lord had chiefly in view must have been one who had trespassed against his brethren ; for what He proceeds to speak of is as to the treatment of such offenders, and as to the extent to which forgiveness might be accorded them. It is not improbable that St Matthew, following Mark in relating here the contest about precedence

between the leading Apostles, has combined with it a section of Q which related what our Lord said when His disciples were unwilling to receive some one whose conduct had given just offence. In this connexion, the verse (Matt. xviii. 11) would be natural and appropriate. If I may indulge in a conjecture, Peter certainly appears to have held the foremost place among the Apostles, and perhaps the rival claims of James and John were first put forward, when the rebuke *Get thee behind me, Satan* was given to Peter in the presence of all the Apostles. Then probably the topic of tenderness to a penitent offender naturally presented itself; and on this supposition the parable of the Unmerciful Servant addressed to Peter gains considerably in force.

On the whole, I am inclined to think that we have here reports by two different hearers of what our Lord said on the occasion of this dispute between the disciples: one by St Matthew, who was one of the outside circle of the Apostles, who had been called in to hear our Lord's words; the other by St Peter, one of the inner circle in which the dispute arose. But St Matthew's account in the Greek Gospel as we have it, may perhaps have been a little coloured in language by what he knew of Peter's account reported by St Mark.

THE DEPARTURE FROM GALILEE

MARK x. 1.

Καὶ ἐκείθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

MATT. xix. 1, 2.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, μετήρην ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ.

We have here the beginning of the account of what proved to be our Lord's final departure from Galilee. It would seem that for some time previously His enemies had been so threatening that He shrank from

publicity; for He Himself had said that it could not be that a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem. And certainly it seems to us that, in the natural course of events, His death could not have produced the same results if He had allowed Himself to be cut off in an obscure corner.¹

We here part company with St Luke who has obtained from other sources a fuller account of our Lord's journey to Jerusalem. It commences with Luke xvii. 11.

THE QUESTION OF DIVORCE

MARK x. 2.

Καὶ [προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι] ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν.

MATT. xix. 3.

Καὶ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι πειράζοντες αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντες, Εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν;

The dependence of St Matthew on Mark in this passage is unmistakable. We have common the words *προσελθόντες, Φαρισαῖοι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν* and there is some unskilful copying, as when *ἐπηρώτων εἰ ἔξεστιν* is altered into *λέγοντες εἰ ἔξεστιν*, and where *τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ* is used without the antecedent *ἀνδρὶ* for *αὐτοῦ* which might have been found in Mark. But the most important difference is that whereas according to St Mark, the Pharisees' question is whether it is lawful for a man to put away his wife, St Matthew adds *for every cause*. If the question had been as St Matthew reports it, the words *πειράζοντες αὐτόν* can hardly be translated *tempting him*; and must rather be rendered *proving him*; for it could scarcely be made a ground of accusation against Jesus that He held a view of

¹ I confess that, on consideration, I am disposed to favour the idea that what St Mark here describes is not the first stage of an intended journey to Jerusalem, but a change, for the time, of our Lord's headquarters from Capernaum to a place beyond Jordan, which I take to be Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter.

the indissolubility of marriage no more rigid than teachers of recognised repute had held before Him.

It is impossible to settle the question of this difference in the form of making the enquiry without taking into account the subsequent difference made by the insertion of the words *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* in Matt. xix. 9, and the corresponding addition of *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* in Matt. v. 32. There is no reasonable doubt that if these words form part of our Lord's precept, then the prohibition against putting away a wife except on account of fornication gives a tacit permission to put away a wife if there had been fornication. This is a good illustration of the maxim *Exceptio probat regulam*.

Omitting the words *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* in Matt. v. 32, it appears to forbid absolutely the putting away a wife no matter how unfaithful; and this, in confessed opposition to the ordinance of Moses. It is because the object of those who put the question to our Lord was to elicit from Him teaching opposed to that of Moses that we can understand in its strictest sense the words applied to them, *tempting him*. They did not ask for information, but in order to draw from Him utterances on which they could found an accusation, or at least excite a prejudice against Him.

I incline to the belief that we ought to accept St Mark's account here as the most literal report of what our Lord said, viz., that He uttered His precept against dissolution of marriage in the most general terms, and without allowance for possible exceptions, that consequently the Pharisees had not asked, May a man put away his wife for any reason he likes? but, Is it lawful for a man ever to put away his wife? and I believe that St Matthew's addition was made in order to bring the precept into conformity with the usage of the Church at the time his Gospel was written (see pp. 130, 131).

MARK x. 3-9.

Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί ὑμῖν ἐνετείλατο Μωυσῆς ; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Ἐπέτρεψεν Μωυσῆς βιβλίον ἀποστασίου γράψαι καὶ ἀπολῦσαι. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐντολήν ταύτην· ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν [αὐτοὺς]. ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σὰρξ· ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

MATT. xix. 4-8.

Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἶπεν, Ἔνεκα τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν ; ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία· ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Τί οὖν Μωυσῆς ἐνετείλατο δοῦναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου καὶ ἀπολῦσαι ; λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι, Μωυσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν ἀπολῦσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως.

It is clear from the Old Testament quotation that the breach of the marriage does not so much consist in the marrying again as in the separation by man of those whom God had joined together ; consequently the sin is as much committed when man ordains a separation from bed and board as when a new marriage is sanctioned.

We are at once struck with a difference of order between Matthew and Mark in the arrangement of the clauses of our Lord's answer. We might suppose that the case merely was that St Matthew, in copying Mark, made variations which for some reason seemed to him to be improvements ; but the use of a different source is suggested by the fact that in the next section there is new matter not derived from Mark ; and I know no reason against supposing that source to have been Q. It may then remain open to consideration whether the coincidences between Matthew and Mark in their reports of the Pharisees' question do not arise from both Evangelists having been under a common obligation to Q. But it seems necessary to acknowledge that this section had been part of Q, and was used by St Mark. St Matthew's version appears to me to have the air of greater originality ; but I am aware how very precarious are any conclusions founded on a judgment of the kind.

MARK x. 10-12.

Καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ
περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. καὶ
λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν
γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην
μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ἂν αὕτη
ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ
ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.

MATT. xix. 9-12.

Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ
τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ
γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται. λέγουσιν
αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, Εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ
αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετὰ τῆς γυναι-
κός, οὐ συμφέρει γαμήσαι. ὁ δὲ
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν
λόγον, ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται. εἰσὶν γὰρ
εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς
ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτως, καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦ-
χοι οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν
ἀνθρώπων, καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες
εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν
τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν
χωρεῖτω.

I confess this is a section where the old idea that St Mark was but an abridger most suggests itself. St Matthew's relation of what our Lord said to His disciples is much fuller than St Mark's, and it is easier to believe that St Mark shortened it than that St Matthew enlarged it. St Mark, however, gives the explanation of one detail which St Matthew's report would only have enabled us to guess at. The subject of divorce was introduced by the Pharisees; the words recorded in these verses tell of a difficulty raised by the disciples. According to Mark, this was because there took place now, what this Evangelist records as having occurred on other occasions, retirement of our Lord to a house, in which His disciples asked for fuller explanations of what they had not sufficiently understood in His public teaching. This would be perfectly plain if the discourse had been represented as taking place at Capernaum; for then τὴν οἰκίαν would mean the same house as that in which He had on previous occasions conversed with His disciples (ix. 33). If we suppose the Pharisees' question to have been put after our Lord had commenced His journey, we are reduced to explain *the house* as merely a general phrase in opposition to *the street*. I prefer to think that our Lord, being now about to depart, resumed His public teaching, which, in the circumstances, would not be dangerous; and that we may understand the definite

article in the strictest sense. At least, this was the explanation with which I at first satisfied myself; but I am now rather disposed to lay the scene of this discourse at Bethsaida Julias.

According to the common text of verse 12, it would seem that our Lord having dealt with the case of a man who divorced his wife, proceeded to consider the case of a woman who divorced her husband. But no such divorce was permitted by Jewish law; and though among the later Romans such things were done, yet even on the supposition that St Mark wrote his Gospel in Rome, it is not likely that the Christian Church at Rome would have occasion, in the Evangelist's lifetime, to consider such a case. We need not doubt that the precept here has reference to a second marriage of a divorced wife, which is regarded as adultery, both on the part of the man who marries her, and on hers. According to the words of the Mosaic law, as interpreted by some Jewish doctors, a man might put away his wife without any other reason than that she did not find favour in his eyes. In such a case our Lord teaches that the violation of the marriage tie by her husband does not loose her obligation to observe it.

The verse, Matt. xix. 12, seems to me one not likely to have been added, if not originally in Q, but it is one which, on account of its difficulty, might easily have been passed over by an Evangelist who was drawing his materials from that source. I do not understand what relevance the saying about eunuchs has, unless we understand the answer to mean: perhaps it is *not* good to marry; but that is a saying which all men cannot receive.

It seems now to me plain that the disciples understood our Lord to say, that it was not lawful to put away one's wife, even in the case of adultery. Surely it would be unreasonable for them to say that it was not good for a man to marry, unless he had the power of unlimited divorce.

THE BLESSING OF THE LITTLE CHILDREN

MARK x. 13-16.

MATT. xix. 13-15.

LUKE xviii. 15-17.

This incident has the same place in Matthew and Mark, namely as an interruption to our Lord's teaching on the subject of divorce ; and therefore we have every reason to suppose that St Matthew is still following Mark. St Luke had been using materials drawn from another source, and has here no connexion with what goes before. But he agrees with the other two Evangelists in making this story immediately precede that of the rich young man. Whether the present incident had been related in Q or not, there is reason to think that St Mark had the fullest information as to the circumstances. We gather from Mark that the incident took place *in the house*. Immediately after (verse 17) we are told that the next thing related took place on the road or street (ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδόν). It follows that it was in the house that children were brought to our Lord to receive His blessing.

The question arises whether it was strange children that were then brought into the house, or whether they were children of the house in which our Lord was then teaching, and who, we may imagine, were brought to Him to say good-night, and receive His blessing before being sent to bed. The latter supposition seems to me the more probable. I have already made this suggestion in reference to the child of which Mark tells in the preceding chapter (ix. 36), that on the occasion of a dispute between the Apostles about precedence, our Lord took it into His arms and made it an example to His disciples. This occurrence also took place *in the house* ; and we can hardly hesitate between the suppositions that our Lord sent out to fetch a child, or that He found one close at hand. It may be added that if it had merely been told that our Lord set the child in the midst, we might easily imagine it to have been a

strange child, but when the Evangelist goes on to tell that our Lord fondled it, taking it into His arms, the impression is produced that it was a child He had known and loved already. We shall not think it a trait unworthy of His divine character, if we learn that He made pets of the children of the house in which He lodged, with the natural consequence that they became much attached to Him.

This question assumes a different aspect, according to our decision on the question that last came before us, namely, whether the house there referred to is the same house in which our Lord had been lodging in Capernaum, and whether, therefore, the incidents here recorded took place before He started on His journey, or whether what is here related took place at some house at which He lodged on the way. There certainly seems great continuity of thought between what our Lord said on the former occasion when He placed a child as a model to His disciples, and on this occasion when He took children into His arms. I incline to the belief that the house was the same as before, and probably was that which belonged to Simon and Andrew, and that the children belonged to the house. It would appear that our Lord and His disciples were about to set out on a journey, and it is very conceivable that the mothers of the children should desire to obtain for them their Master's blessing before His departure. It is conceivable also that the intrusion of those children might have appeared to the disciples as an unseemly interruption of our Lord's teaching, and that the women who brought them in might be rebuked by their husbands.

THE RICH YOUNG MAN

MARK x. 17-22.

MATT. xix. 16-22.

LUKE xviii. 18-23.

There is so much of coincidence, and even of verbal agreement, between these accounts as to leave no doubt

of their having had a common original. Note, for example, the καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι common to all. These words I do not understand as a mere summons to the applicant to become a disciple, which in some senses he probably already was; but as a call to him to forsake all other business, and to go about with Jesus in His little company of personal attendants. St Mark's account might well be accepted as the original of the other two versions.

The person who asked our Lord this question is very commonly described as *the young ruler*. It may be mentioned, however, that St Mark does not say that he was either young or a ruler. It is only St Luke who says that he was a ruler; but there seems no reason to suppose that Luke was in possession of any independent information beyond what he might have learnt from the other two accounts that have come down to us. We may conclude that he uses the word ἄρχων to denote, not official rank, but social position. The man is described as one of great wealth, and no doubt enjoyed high consideration among his countrymen.

It is St Matthew alone who describes this man as young, for he uses with respect to him the word νεανίσκος, which he did not find in Mark, and probably got from some other source of information. There is no real contradiction between the use of this word and the saying of the man, *All these things have I observed* ἐκ νεότητός μου. These words are attested both by Mark and Luke; and we may infer were found in the Aramaic Gospel. They are also found in St Matthew in early Latin versions and in other ancient authorities, but they are absent from those MSS. which have preserved for us what may be regarded as the oldest text. The word νεανίσκος might be used of one in early middle life; and such a man could without impropriety refer to the days of his youth. Yet there is an apparent inconsistency, which might be felt by transcribers, and cause them to omit the words ἐκ

νεότητός μου. And I do not reject the solution that this inconsistency might have been felt by the translator of the Aramaic Gospel into Greek; in which case we must believe that the presence of the words in the majority of MSS. arose from an assimilation of the one Gospel to the other two. I must own that it is in this part of Matthew that I find most to justify the hypothesis that a translation of the Aramaic Gospel earlier than St Mark's had gained some currency—an opinion which we have scarcely evidence enough to warrant our adopting, but which we cannot summarily set aside as inadmissible. I find, however, so many coincidences with Mark as to lead me to think that St Matthew, in using a common source, availed himself of his knowledge of the form in which St Mark had previously presented the same story.

We come now to the most striking difference between St Mark's version of a Gospel saying and that of St Matthew, at least as his text is given by the oldest witnesses. Did the rich man say *Διδάσκαλε* or *Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ*? the importance of the difference being that the latter form harmonises with our Lord's question, *Why callest thou me good?* the other form places the word *good* in the latter part of the question, viz., *What good thing shall I do?* our Lord's reply then being, *Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?*

There are two questions to which we are not warranted in assuming that the same answer must be given, viz., What words on any particular occasion our Lord is most likely to have spoken? and, What words this or that Evangelist is most likely to have recorded?

In judging of the relative antiquity of two versions of a saying of our Lord, we may reasonably pronounce that to be the earlier which seems less likely to have been altered into the other; and, on these grounds, we may in this instance give preference to the form in which St Mark records our Lord's words over that which they have in the text accepted as Matthew's

by critical editors. Every commentator has found it a difficulty that our Lord should seem to decline the title *good* when addressed to Him. I need not discuss the well-known explanation that our Lord's question *Why callest thou me good?* is not to be understood as meaning *You ought not to call me good*, but only as *On what grounds do you ascribe goodness to me?* I think it will not be disputed that to His followers generally that version of His words would be most agreeable which did not need explanation to reconcile it with their conviction that He was, in the highest sense of the word, good.

But even though we decide to accept St Mark's report as giving the most accurate representation of the words spoken by our Lord, it by no means follows that the correct text of Matthew must agree with Mark. In fact we have the testimony of Origen (*Comm. in Matt.*, tom. xv. 10) that in his time it did not; and in addition, we must take into account the fact that the earliest Latin translations afford proof that this form of Matthew's text was not confined to Alexandria. We need not enquire whether this was because the manuscripts from which the translation was made had been derived from that centre of learned Christianity, or because MSS. of the same type had reached the West independently.

I have already indicated my opinion that St Matthew's Gospel is a later authority than St Mark's; so that we need not wonder if some things in which a difficulty might be felt have been smoothed away. I attribute this smoothing to the editor of St Matthew's Gospel himself, and not to his transcribers. In the latter case, why should we not find the same variation of reading in the Gospels of St Mark and St Luke? If an orthodox editor or transcriber had introduced a change into his text of Matthew in order to make it, as he supposed, more consistent with the honour due to our Lord, he would have been likely to make the same change in the parallel passages in the other two Gospels.

Now any one who recognises the authority of the Evangelists must believe, on the unquestioned testimony of St Mark, that our Lord on this occasion uttered the words, *Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God.* If we ask why the Antioch critics did not remove a "seeming contradiction" in their Gospels by altering the words in Mark, we need not hesitate to reply, It was because these words had been so established in the unbroken tradition of their Church, that it was hopeless to attempt to change them. We can have no better witness to the tradition of the Church of Antioch than St Luke. Whether he merely copied Mark, or is to be regarded as an independent witness to our Lord's words, in either case he gives us reason to believe that the Gospel as read at Antioch recorded our Lord's answer in the form, *Why callest thou me good?*

It had occurred to me as possible that Mark's imperfect (ἐπιφρώτα) might be understood to imply that the rich man had put his question more than once, and that thus there would be no contradiction between Evangelists who recorded different forms in which the question had been put. But I am now disposed rather to think that the imperfect tense indicates that the young man puts a question which he had asked before, and that now, learning our Lord's approaching departure, he runs up to ask it once more before our Lord goes away. For the rest of the story is, in each of its forms, too consistent with itself to allow us to believe that the diversity alleged to exist between two Evangelists had an accidental origin. If St Mark has truly stated that our Lord uttered the words *Why callest thou me good?* it necessarily follows that His questioner had called Him *good*; in other words, that the address διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ is distinctly vouched by St Mark, and that a report which omits the epithet ἀγαθέ cannot be accepted as faithful. Thus, then, it is not surprising if several of the authorities which support α B in giving our Lord's answer as *Why askest thou me concerning goodness?* do not venture to omit the epithet ἀγαθέ.

With regard to the question, I must pronounce these authorities to have made a conflation between the only two admissible forms, viz., either *Good Master*, followed by *Why callest thou me good?* or else *What good thing shall I do?* followed by *Why askest thou me concerning goodness?*

In respect of probability, St Mark's version has a manifest superiority. According to his account, a natural question receives a completely appropriate answer. The other version presents the difficulties—(1) that the form of question, *What good thing shall I do?* instead of *What shall I do?* is not a natural one, and gives us the impression that the adjective *good* was thrust in, in order to make occasion for the answer about *goodness*; (St Luke, who (x. 25) records the same question as put by a lawyer, reports it in the natural form, *What shall I do to inherit eternal life?*); (2) that the answer is by no means relevant, seeing that the question asked was not concerning goodness in the abstract, but concerning the conditions of obtaining eternal life; and (3) that the statement that God only is good, which is quite appropriate when used to exclude the application of the title *good* to any other, does not by any means exclude the performance by another of at least one good deed. The conclusion at which I arrive is that if we want to know what our Lord said we must accept St Mark's account as the original report; but that if the posteriority of Matthew is frankly acknowledged, we need not be surprised if we find in his Gospel a less accurate report.

The account of this incident given in the Alexandrian¹ form of Matthew is greatly lacking in independent confirmation. Justin Martyr twice refers to the incident (*Apol.* i., c. 16; *Trypho.*, 101), and both times according to St Mark's form. The testimony of Irenæus, as far as it can be counted on either side, is against the Alexandrian form.

¹ For brevity I give this name to the text of St Matthew which has the earliest attestations, the witnesses being for the most part Alexandrian.

We have also to take into consideration that the same phenomenon presents itself in the Clementine Homilies (xviii. 3). The presumption always is that a Gospel quotation in the Clementine Homilies comes from St Matthew's Gospel, from which there are more than twice as many quotations as from Mark and Luke put together. In this case, however, there is no room for doubt. The Clementine version agrees in substance with Mark, but in form with Matthew. The question is not, *What good thing shall I do?* but *What shall I do?* Our Lord is reported as saying, *Do not call me good, for there is One good, the Father in Heaven*, and then as going on to say, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments*. Thereupon the querist replies, *Which?* I willingly concede that the Clementine writer is quite capable of altering a Gospel citation in order to make it more suitable to his purpose; but I cannot see that he had any motive for doing so in this case. No doubt we must admit the possibility that he might have mixed up in his memory the statements of two Gospels. Still the fact remains that we fail to find any confirmation of the Alexandrian form of Matthew, and that what we must regard as the most striking peculiarity of that form seems altogether to have escaped the notice, or the memory, of those who we have reason to think held St Matthew's Gospel in special honour. I consider then that there is no sufficient ground for asserting that the Antioch critics who refused to adopt the Alexandrian reading were actuated by mistaken critical principles, and not by unwillingness to alter the ancient tradition of their Church.

There is, however, very early evidence for the form, *What good thing shall I do?* in a story purporting to be taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews reported by a Latin translator of Origen in a passage the Greek of which is lost. *Comm. in Matt.*, tom. xv. 14, *vetus interpretatio*, quoted *Introd. N.T.*, p. 165.

But there is a question which cannot be evaded by a candid investigator: Is it not possible that the Alexandrian critics may have rightly preserved for us the true text as written by the author of our Greek First Gospel, only that that author was not St Matthew? And I frankly confess that something of that kind is the conclusion at which I have arrived myself. What we now call St Matthew's Gospel contains a quantity of matter presenting such marks of antiquity and authenticity that I cannot reject the tradition that it came direct from an Apostle. In fact, I count St Matthew's report of our Lord's discourses as the most accurate. But, on the other hand, there are passages which, in my judgment, exhibit clear signs of dependence on St Mark's Gospel. It seems to me that the best way of reconciling these phenomena is to accept what is also an ancient tradition, viz., that St Matthew wrote his Gospel in Aramaic, and that what we now know as St Matthew's Gospel is a Greek Gospel of later date, but founded on the original Aramaic.

But if we have St Matthew's work only in the form given it by an unknown editor, why preserve with painful accuracy blunders which we do not regard as part of the original? Why should we blame the Antioch critics if they occasionally removed a statement which they felt must be erroneous because contradicting something that had come to them on higher authority? They were not doing a work of literary curiosity, such as is done when the first edition of an old book is reprinted with all its misprints and *errata*. Their object was not literary, but theological and historical. They desired to have a truthful record of our Lord's earthly life, to be periodically read in their Church assemblies for the edification of their people. The assent we give to our Gospels mainly rests on the fact that all over the Christian world they were used for this purpose from the earliest

times; and it rests in a much lower degree on the credit due to their authors, of whom, apart from this work of theirs, we know extremely little.

Believing then, as I do, that the first publication of the Gospel was oral, not literary, I count it to be as unreasonable to ask for the Apostolic autograph of St Matthew's Gospel as it would be to demand the original MS. of Shakespeare's plays, the first publication of which was made, not by printed books, but by public recitation. Though I ascribe extremely high authority to the readings of that ancient MS. which was a common ancestor of the Vatican and Sinaitic, yet I do not rate that authority higher than that possessed by the First Folio of Shakespeare, or the first editions of separate plays, the readings of which we do not scruple to reject, because we have no reason to believe that the press had been corrected by the poet himself.

Applying now these general remarks to the criticism of the First Gospel, no reader of that Gospel can help feeling that we have in it a most precious and most authentic record of our Lord's teaching; and if we had no other Gospel, we should scarcely have ventured on a task so precarious as to attempt to discriminate between the antiquity of its various parts. But we have two other Gospels showing in many places such close affinity with St Matthew's that we cannot help concluding that either these two made use of St Matthew's Gospel, or else that all three drew from a common source. The latter was the conclusion to which I found myself forced to give the preference. I provisionally called that source Q, not wishing to anticipate any conclusions to which more detailed study might lead me. Still, as there seemed to be indications that the source was Aramaic, I find it increasingly difficult to resist the conclusion that what I have called Q is no other than the Aramaic Matthew, to which tradition points as the earliest of the Gospel narratives.

The reasons for regarding the Aramaic Matthew as not the sole source of our Greek First Gospel are— (1) that there are some sections of the latter with which Mark and Luke show no signs of acquaintance, and with the statements in which they do not always even seem to agree ; (2) that in the places in which Matthew and Mark agree there is often more identity of language than a common Aramaic source will account for ; (3) that, when we examine more closely, we more frequently find reason to think that the editor of the Greek Gospel borrowed his language from Mark than *vice versâ* ; (4) that duplicates occur in the narrative of our Greek Matthew which are best explained by the hypothesis that its editor used a double source.

These results of criticism substantially agree with all that historical testimony enables us to assert ; and if they be accepted as correct, we may place the Gospel records in chronological order as follows : First must have come the lost Aramaic by St Matthew, which is the basis of all three Synoptics ; next would come Mark, whose Greek appears to have been used both by “ Matthew ” and St Luke. As between the last two, the Greek Matthew seems to show more signs of posteriority ; but, until I am shown more satisfactory proof of acquaintance by either with the work of the other, I must hold that the interval between their dates of composition was not so long as to allow time for the earlier of the two to pass from being the local form in which in a particular district the history of our Saviour’s life was told, to become the property of the whole Church, and thus arrive at such general circulation as necessarily to become known at a distance from its place of composition.

It does not come within the scope of this essay to treat of the Fourth Gospel ; but its Evangelist was clearly acquainted with St Luke’s Gospel ; and I find no reason for being less confident about his knowledge of St Mark’s. He could hardly have been ignorant of the Aramaic Matthew, since he shews acquaintance

with that language; but as to his use of the Greek Matthew I have not yet been able to come to a positive conclusion. I find no chronological difficulty in believing that he might have known it; for both the Greek Matthew and St John's Gospel appear to me to have been products of the same age, which may be described either as late in the Apostolic age, or early in the sub-Apostolic. I suspend my judgment on the question whether some points of coincidence between these two documents, if more than casual, are best explained by assuming the Greek editor's acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel, or *vice versâ*.¹

¹ I add here a few notes bearing on the question whether the Fourth Evangelist was acquainted with the Greek Matthew. I use the abbreviation G in referring to things related in our present Matthew, but which, as not having been utilised by St Mark, seem more likely to have been added by the Greek translator. I must not be accused of unwarranted assumption of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, if I find it convenient to refer to its author as J.

i. According to G, John the Baptist had discerned the dignity of Jesus before he baptized Him, and was on that account unwilling to perform that ministration; according to J, it was not until the Baptist saw the Holy Ghost descending on Jesus after His baptism that he knew by this appointed sign that Jesus was the destined successor who was to baptize with the Holy Ghost. Twice the Baptist (John i. 31, 33) is made to say *I knew Him not*. No doubt the contradiction may be only apparent. The Baptist may have felt that he had rightly discerned the dignity of this candidate for his baptism, but yet that he was not warranted to proclaim that this was He who was to baptize with the Holy Ghost, until the appointed sign had been given. But even though there is no real contradiction between G and J, the question arises whether the latter would not have avoided even the appearance of contradiction if he had known the work of the former. This argument would be more conclusive if in other cases J followed carefully the statements of his predecessors; but we cannot but be struck with the freedom with which he habitually follows a line of his own. Nor can we regard this as any disparagement of his trustworthiness. One who is dependent on second-hand information is bound to follow his authorities scrupulously, and not go beyond what his informants have told him. But one who writes from first hand knowledge of the facts is under no obligation to study how the story had been told by persons with no better means of knowledge than himself. The seeming discordance, then, between J and G is only a presumption, but not a proof that the former was unacquainted with the work of the latter.

ii. An illustration of the difficulty of pressing the argument from apparent contradictions is afforded by another example. J represents the Baptist as answering *I am not* to the question *Art thou Elijah?* This is quite reconcilable with what on other grounds we infer as to his use of Luke who speaks (i. 17) of the Baptist as coming *in the spirit and power of Elijah*. Still it would lead us to think that he had not read Matt. xi. 14, *If ye are willing to receive it, this is Elijah which is to come*. Yet if he knew St Mark's Gospel, of which I make no doubt, he might have read there (ix. 13)

It will have been seen that the question what is the true reading of Matthew xix. 17 has an important bearing on the question of the date of the current Greek version of St Matthew's Gospel. If we had to decide whether on this occasion our Lord said, as Mark reports, *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν*; or according to the Alexandrian text of Matthew, *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*; we must pronounce that the latter account has clear marks of posteriority; for it is enough to say that if this had been the original reading there would have been no temptation to alter it; while it is quite intelligible that a difficulty should very early be felt in an account which represented our Lord as disclaiming a right to the attribute *good*. I say *very early*, for if we examine the conceptions of our Lord's Person entertained by the Fourth Evangelist, or by St Paul, as for instance in the Epistle to the Colossians, we cannot doubt that in the first generation of Christians there must have existed that same reverent feeling which makes a Christian of the present day glad to be told some explanation or modification of the answer which St Mark represents our Lord as giving.

If we desire to know the date of the Greek Matthew I think we can at least put a lower limit on it. In the first place, Justin Martyr was acquainted with it. I base this assertion on a comparison of Matt. xiii. 55 with Mark vi. 3, to my comments on which latter passage I refer my reader. I think that a comparison between the two passages leaves no doubt that both represent a common original. But there is the striking difference that in St Mark's account Jesus is described as *the carpenter*, in St Matthew's as *the carpenter's son*. In my judgment, the latter report has strong marks of posteriority. If the common original had described Jesus as *the carpenter's son*, we can see no reason why St Mark should have altered it; on the other hand, I

But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, words which hardly need the commentary which St Matthew has added (xvii. 13), *Then understood the disciples that He spake unto them of John the Baptist.*

see no evidence that Jesus had worked as a τέκτων after He had left the town where He had been brought up, and devoted Himself to the work of public teaching. A considerable interval must have intervened between His departure as a young man from His native city, and His return to it, attended by a body of disciples, and already famous not only for His teaching, but for His miraculous cures, the like of which His fellow-townsmen expected to witness. It is quite conceivable that these disciples, or perhaps their successors of the next generation, should have regarded carpenter's work as beneath their Master's dignity, and that in this reverential feeling the version *the carpenter's son* had its origin. The relevance of this various reading to the question immediately before us is that Justin Martyr appears to have known both Matthew's form and Mark's. He describes our Lord (*Trypho*, 88) as counted the son of Joseph (τοῦ τέκτονος), and he also speaks of our Lord as having been Himself a τέκτων, and as having wrought τεκτονικὰ ἔργα, of which he names the making of ploughs and yokes. I do not venture to count this statement of Justin's as an authority independent of Mark, out of whose phrase ὁ τέκτων a tradition might easily have been developed.

But on this subject must be quoted another witness to St Mark's report, namely, the opponent of Christianity, Celsus, who speaks (Origen, *Cont. Cels.* vi. 34-36) of the common mention among Christians of the *tree of life* and the *resurrection of the flesh from the tree*, which, he says, had its origin *I suppose because their teacher had been nailed to the cross, and because he had been a τέκτων by trade*. But the strangest thing about this objection of Celsus is Origen's reply: *Celsus has failed to take notice that Jesus is never described as a τέκτων in the Gospels which are current in the Churches*. There can be no doubt that ὁ τέκτων is the true reading of Mark, and also that this Gospel was received and current in all the Churches. This reply, then, of Origen's must be explained in one or other of two ways. There is evidence, chiefly

Western, that copies of St Mark's Gospel had a certain limited circulation in which Mark's τέκτων had been replaced by Matthew's τέκτονος υἱός. It may be that it was a MS. of this type that Origen was using when he was replying to Celsus. If we reject this explanation, we must simply believe that Origen's memory here played him false, and that though he remembered having seen Jesus described as a τέκτων he imagined that it was in an apocryphal Gospel he had seen it.

There is, however, little need to elaborate a proof that the Greek Matthew was in circulation in the time of Justin, that is to say, in the middle of the second century, if I am right in believing that it was read by Ignatius in the beginning of that century. He says of our Lord (*Smyrn.* 1) βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου ἵνα πληρωθῇ πάντα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, where there is a manifest reference to our Lord's answer (*Matt.* iii. 15) when John scrupled to baptize Him, πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πάντα δικαιοσύνην. There are other signs of the use of the Greek Gospel by Ignatius; for instance (*Polyc.* 2), φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐν πάσιν καὶ ἀκέραιος εἰσαεὶ ὡς ἡ περιστέρα which is in close verbal accord with *Matt.* x. 16, a saying which has no parallel in Mark or Luke. There are other parallels between Ignatius and Matthew which I do not quote; either because the verbal similarity is less close, or because there is a possibility that Ignatius might have been using another Gospel as his authority. The passage of Ignatius, however, which I first quoted, viz., that founded on *Matt.* iii. 15, deserves attention, because we may infer from the silence of Mark and Luke that it was drawn from a source not used by them, and because it has what may be regarded as marks of posteriority. An Evangelist could not be expected to record every saying of our Lord; and therefore, though St Luke did not include in his work the saying *Be ye wise as serpents*, we could not infer that he did not find this saying in the source which he had in common with St Mark. But I cannot help thinking that if either St Mark or St

Luke had found in Q this account of the reluctance of John to baptize our Lord, he would have recorded it in his Gospel. The Baptist's reluctance could only have arisen from divine inspiration; for as yet our Lord had done no public work which might have manifested His glory. The recording of this reluctance was a useful safeguard against a natural inference that He who sought baptism thereby owned inferiority to the baptizer; and so I think it unlikely that St Mark or St Luke would have omitted this safeguard, if he had found it in the Aramaic Matthew.

Again, the need of some explanation must have been suggested by St Matthew's statement that those who desired to be baptized by John came *confessing their sins*. The question then suggests itself, Why then was Jesus baptized? What sins had He to confess? St Matthew's solution of this difficulty received ornamentation in the Jewish section of the Church. See citations from The Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Pseudo Cyprian's *De Rebaptismate* on p. 46. It appears to me the best explanation of the omission in Mark and Luke of a safeguard provided by St Matthew against a wrong inference from the fact of our Lord's having been baptized by John, is that this inference resulted from a reflective meditation on the story, and had not been drawn at the time of composition of St Mark's Gospel or St Luke's. It certainly had been drawn in the time of Justin Martyr who, in a passage already referred to (*Trypho*, 88), describes our Lord as coming to be baptized οὐχ ὡς ἐνδεᾶ αὐτὸν τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι. We have the same idea in Clement of Alexandria (*Eclog. Proph.*, 7), διὰ τοῦτο ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐβαπτίσατο μὴ χρήζων αὐτός. The idea common to both passages, that Jesus had *not* need to be baptized, seems to me to have been suggested by the Baptist's confession reported in the Greek Matthew that he himself *had* need to be baptized, ἐγὼ κρίαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σου βαπτισθῆναι.

In what precedes, I have chiefly occupied myself with a comparison of St Matthew's account with St

Mark's. It is time now to consider the variations of Luke.

One of the most striking differences between St Luke's version of this story and St Matthew's relates to the order in which the Ten Commandments are quoted. St Matthew's order is that usual amongst ourselves, in which the commandment *Thou shalt do no murder* precedes the command *Thou shalt not commit adultery*. St Luke, following Mark, reverses this order. This variation arises from a variation in then current texts of the Septuagint: Cod. B., in Deut. v., places the commandments in the order in which Luke has them; Philo has the same order (*De Decalogo*, 24 and 32), and founds an argument on it; and so likewise does Tertullian (*De Pudic.*, 5), who builds his whole argument on the fact, that in the Decalogue the prohibition against adultery is placed before that against murder. This is also St Paul's order (Rom. xiii. 9), and apparently it is likewise the order of St James (ii. 11). We need not wonder, then, if St Luke used the order common in Pauline circles.

It is to be noted that all three Evangelists agree in placing the command *Honour thy father and mother* in a place by itself at the end. The explanation seems to be that our Lord had shortly before reproached the Pharisees with their neglect of this command of Moses (Mark vii. 10; Matt. xv. 4), and therefore if the citation of the Commandments had commenced with the first of the second table of the Law, it would be felt that this command ought not to be omitted from the recital.

But the most remarkable of St Matthew's additions is that, at the end, he places *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*. He has this precept elsewhere in the same context as the other Synoptics; but the placing it here is peculiar to Matthew. It was natural that a Christian should add to his list of Commandments this which our Lord had taught as the compendium of the whole second table of the Law; and so we find St Paul introducing it in Romans xiii. 9; but I cannot think that the

original could have contained the precept in this place ; for if our Lord had quoted it so, the rich man would have scarcely been so ready with the answer *All these things have I observed.*

It ought to be noted how St Luke (xii. 33) converts into a general precept what had been uttered as a special command to this rich man, *Sell that ye have, and give alms.* St Luke has a special sympathy for the poor. In his Gospel the benediction which in Matthew appears as one on the poor *in spirit*, seems to be on actual poverty ; and the story of Dives and Lazarus brings out the irony of the contrast between the share of the rich in temporal and in eternal happiness respectively. What he tells in the Acts about the communism of Christians immediately after our Lord's departure accounts for his recording sayings of our Lord which justified, if they did not suggest, that institution.

OUR LORD'S REFLECTIONS ON THE RICH MAN'S REFUSAL

MARK x. 23-27.

MATT. xix. 23-26.

LUKE xviii. 24-27.

The chief difference in this section between Mark and the other two Evangelists is that St Mark represents our Lord, when He saw the astonishment felt by the disciples at His declaration of the difficulty of a rich man's entering the kingdom of God, as repeating the announcement in a more startling form. Yet though St Matthew and St Luke each record only a single utterance of this declaration, there is nothing in either case to forbid our supposing that they drew their information from Mark. It is a sufficient explanation of St Luke's version to say that it is only St Mark's abbreviated. Matthew in a different way shows traces of the influence of Mark. St Mark having told

of the amazement of the disciples at our Lord's declaration, then introduces the saying about the camel and the needle's eye with ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει. St Matthew says nothing about the amazement of the disciples; but he introduces the saying about the camel and the needle's eye with πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν. I cannot but think that the πάλιν here indicates a use of St Mark's Gospel.

So far we might seem to be on firm ground; but when we proceed to the next verse in Mark, we come to a question by no means easy to answer. St Mark having told of the amazement of the disciples at the saying *How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!* represents our Lord as repeating the saying in the form *How hard is it for them that TRUST IN riches to enter into the kingdom of God!* Now if our Lord said the same thing twice over, it would be natural for the narrator to content himself, as St Luke does, with telling it once, unless the second time it was said with a variation. Here, according to St Mark, there was an important variation, mitigating greatly the harshness of the saying, by the explanation that the difficulty of entering the kingdom of God arises, not from the possession of riches, but from putting trust in them. It is strange then that so important a mitigation should not have been noticed by the other two Evangelists who tell the story.

Yet St Mark's own account would give the impression that our Lord's object in repeating His saying was not to soften it, but to strengthen it; for it is on the repetition that he states the difficulty in the harshest form, namely, with the addition about the camel and the needle's eye. And it would appear that the hearers were unconscious of any mitigation; for if they had been astonished before, we are told now that they περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο, and said among themselves καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; St Luke here verbally copies Mark. St Matthew has τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι.

This difficulty is smoothed away in our two oldest

extant MSS., B^s, which omit the words *for them that trust in riches*, but, however, are only supported by a couple of the witnesses that usually join in their attestation. Nevertheless, it is certain that the insertion of these words is extremely ancient; for they are quoted as Mark's by Clement of Alexandria, whose tract *Quis dives salvetur* is of the nature of a commentary on this story. Clement quotes it at length as from Mark; but two or three verbal alterations seemingly derived from Matthew make it probable that he is quoting from memory; still this does not throw any doubt on the fact that it is from St Mark's Gospel that he derived these words, there being no other Gospel which contains them.

My own judgment inclines to the paradoxical conclusion that the evidence is in favour of the opinion that the words *for them that trust in riches* belong to the genuine text of Mark, but not in favour of the opinion that they were spoken by our Lord. It is difficult to think that if the longer form had not been in the original Mark it could have got into the received text so early as the time of Clement, and that the abridged form could have found such poor reception afterwards. Again, if the words had been inserted by scribes or editors in order to diminish the startling effect of our Lord's saying, the insertion would have been made in all three Gospels. Therefore if these words were not written by St Mark, they must have been inserted at that early time when that Gospel circulated singly for the use of people acquainted with no other. Certainly my first impression was that the words *for them that trust in riches* belong to the genuine text of Mark, and that the omission of them in a small number of copies arose from the assimilation of Mark's account to that of the other Gospels. Indeed the witnesses for the abridged text might possibly be reduced to a single MS.; for B and ~~α~~ both came out of the same workshop, and the same MS. may have been used by both transcribers, only by the scribe of the Sinaitic with more

consultation of other MSS. than by the scribe of the Vatican.

One is certainly not attracted by the form to which our Lord's saying is reduced when the disputed words are struck out of St Mark's report. It then becomes merely *How hard is it to enter into the kingdom of God!* That is to say, the question whether riches are a hindrance to entering is lost sight of; and we are merely reminded how difficult it is for *any one* to enter the kingdom of God. I am bound to give due weight to arguments against the view to which I am myself inclined; and therefore I must not omit to notice that the disciples' exclamation *Then who can be saved?* would come most naturally if our Lord's saying had been *How difficult it is for any one to be saved!*

On the whole I am inclined to accept St Luke's report as that which approaches most nearly to what our Lord said. If some softening of its apparent harshness were made, whether by St Mark himself, or by a very early transcriber, the case would be parallel with the insertion of *ἐκκῆ* in Matt. v. 22; of *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* in Matt. v. 32; of *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* in Matt. xix. 9; and of *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ* in Matt. xix. 17. In like manner I am disposed to believe that our Lord gave no other softening of the apparent harshness of the present saying than *The things which are impossible with men are possible with God.*

Our decision about the present various reading strongly affects our decision on a point which is of importance in the investigations of this essay. Did St Matthew and St Luke know the Greek Q only through Mark's translation? or had they the use of an independent version? Matthew and Luke have several striking coincidences with the Greek of Mark; and if they had no other authority than Mark for this story, they must be added to the list of witnesses for the shorter form of Mark, since it is not likely that if they had known the longer one, they would have preferred to tell the story in a way so much more likely to cause

perplexity to those who read it. On the other hand, it complicates the hypothesis very much if we postulate the existence of another translation from the Aramaic, from which St Mark must have borrowed much of his language.

PETER'S CLAIM

MARK x. 28-31. MATT. xix. 27-30. LUKE xviii. 28-30.
Compare with Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 29, 30.

On the question whether the other two Evangelists copied Mark must be taken into account the Marcan features in this section which do not appear in the other Gospels. In the first place, I note the phrase, Mark x. 29, *for my sake, and for the gospel's sake*. Here Luke has *for the kingdom of God's sake*; and Matthew *for my name's sake*. This phrase *for my sake and the gospel's* is especially Marcan. We had it (viii. 35) *Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's*. The saying is found twice in Matthew (x. 39; xvi. 25), but there the phrase is *for my sake*, and there is no mention of *the gospel*. (See *supra*, p. 37.)

I own that to me the surprising thing is, not that St Mark should have adopted the Pauline use of this word, but that St Luke should not have done so. Nevertheless, early though this use of the word *Gospel* to denote the whole subject of the Christian preaching undoubtedly is, yet there is not evidence that it was so used in the Aramaic Matthew, or in whatever work was the earliest attempt to record the work and teaching of our Lord. And therefore, on the ground of this phrase alone, I am disposed to believe that St Matthew and St Luke here used an authority earlier than Mark.

I draw the same inference from the words *μετὰ ὁωγμῶν* in Mark x. 30, which are not found in the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke. I find it hard

to believe that if these Evangelists had found these words in the authority which they were using, they would have suppressed them, and have recorded the promise of a return even in this life for sacrifices made for Christ, without adding the warning which the Apostle has expressed in the form (2 Tim. iii. 12): *All that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.* St Paul, in writing to the Thessalonians, reminds them (1 Thess. iii. 4) how he had told them beforehand that they should suffer affliction; and our Lord Himself never omitted to warn those who desired to become His disciples to count the cost beforehand; and even if the authority which St Mark was using had made no mention in this place of the cautions which our Lord always joined to His promises, it would not surprise us that the Evangelist should supply this deficiency; but the converse supposition, of the suppressing of a recorded warning is quite inadmissible.

St Mark is here more cautious than St Matthew or St Luke; for he gives an enumeration showing that a wife is not included in the list of things to be parted with, and to be given back in this life a hundredfold. I have already noted the parallel between Matt. xix. 28 and Luke xxii. 30 which is probably explained as an insertion in this place by St Matthew of words spoken by our Lord at a later time.

St Matthew records the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard as spoken on this occasion; and his report is amply confirmed by its special appropriateness. St Peter had attempted to stipulate for a reward for the sacrifices which he and his brethren had made; and he is taught by this parable that while every promise made would be amply fulfilled, yet that they who had made no stipulation might receive a greater reward. St Mark's silence about this parable is sufficiently accounted for by the limitations of his plan, which left him room for but few specimens of our Lord's method of teaching by parables.

MARK x. 32-34.

Ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαλόντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο. καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν ὅτι, Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαλόμεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσιν, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαίζουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν, καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.

MATT. xx. 17-19.

Μέλλων δὲ ἀναβαίνειν Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παρέλαβεν τοὺς δώδεκα [μαθητὰς] κατ' ἰδίαν, καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαλόμεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ γραμματεῦσιν, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν [θανάτῳ], καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται.

LUKE xviii. 31-34.

Παραλαβὼν δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαλόμεν εἰς Ἱεροσολίμην, καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαυχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται, καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται. Καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνήκαν, καὶ ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα.

These three accounts are plainly copies of the same original. St Luke's dependence on Mark is very manifest, for he copies Mark's relation of the prophecy of the spitting and the scourging, though in his own account of the Crucifixion he does not mention either. St Luke here adds a reference to the fulfilment of prophecy in the ill-treatment of our Lord, and at the end he mentions, as he had done before, ix. 45, the failure of the disciples to understand predictions of their Master's rejection. I should gather from these accounts that our Lord had not previously announced His intention of going up to Jerusalem, a place where they had reason to know from His own warnings, if not otherwise, that His life would be in danger; and it would seem that they became aware of His intentions by His joining Himself with others bound on the same journey. Then, when He saw their alarm, He took the Twelve aside, and privately made them understand that He was fully aware of the consequences of the step He was taking.

There is a certain ambiguity in St Mark's form of expression: are we to understand οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες of the Twelve? or of the crowds which accompanied Jesus?

St Mark afterwards records the literal fulfilment of all the particulars here predicted. Thus the *παραδοθήσεται* of verse 33 appears again in xiv. 41, 42, 44; for it is the same word which is translated *delivered* in chap. x. which is rendered *betrayed* in chap. xiv. They into whose hands our Lord was to be delivered are here described as οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, to whom are added in xiv. 43 καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. This last word, though not found in this place, had been introduced in the previous prediction viii. 31. We might translate it *Senators*, for it is a general word including all the members of the Sanhedrin. We find it so used, Acts xxii. 5; see also Luke xxii. 66. Again, we have in Mark xiv. 64 the historical account of the fulfilment of the prediction κατακρινούσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ; and in xv. 1 that of παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, and in xv. 19 that of ἐμπαλξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτῷ, the verbal correspondence in all these passages being very striking.

THE REQUEST OF THE SONS OF ZEBEDEE

MARK x. 35-40.

MATT. xx. 20-23.

The identity of the two narratives is manifest; the only question is whether St Matthew is here using Mark as his authority, or whether he drew from an independent source. On the side of Matthew's independence of Mark may be urged the great probability that the two disciples made their mother their mouthpiece, a detail which St Matthew did not learn from Mark. St Matthew might easily have learnt the fact of her presence from some other source than Mark. Admitting this, I still believe that St Matthew borrowed his account from Mark with some trivial alterations of his own.

Whether the disciples used their mother's mediation or not, it is to them and not to her that our Lord addresses His answer, *Ye know not what ye ask, etc.*

There is, of course, the possibility that at the time when St Matthew's Gospel was published, the consideration in the Church of James and John was so high that there was a desire to throw some of the responsibility for this demand from the Apostles on their mother.

But the most important difference is that St Matthew, according to his oldest text, omits in verse 38 of Mark the words *ἡ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι*, as well as the corresponding words in verse 39. I do not know what account is to be given of this omission except that the editor of the Greek Matthew did not understand the metaphor used. But that the expression was really used by our Lord on this occasion is made probable by independent testimony to the use of the same metaphor by our Lord on another occasion, *I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!* (Luke xii. 50). This testimony from Luke is the more important as that Evangelist does not record the incident now under consideration.

THE MUTUAL JEALOUSIES OF THE APOSTLES

MARK x. 41-45.

Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, καὶ ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δούλος· καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

MATT. xx. 24-28.

Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς εἶπεν, Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. οὐχ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, καὶ ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δούλος· ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

We must note Mark's *began to be moved with indignation*. It surely does not mean that the other Apostles

were in a permanent state of indignation against James and John, which had its origin in the claim now made for them. We ought rather to note that St Mark habitually refuses to use the aorist where it is not a definite incident that is spoken of, but a continuous state of feeling. In speaking of such a state, he ordinarily uses the imperfect tense, except on the first occasion that he has to speak of it, when he usually has *began* with the infinitive.

The verbal coincidences between Matthew and Mark in this passage are such as to prove that we have here two versions of the same original ; and I believe the case to be that St Matthew copies Mark.

These precepts of humility seem to have been given more than once. We hear first of the disputes which suggested them as arising immediately after our Lord's rebuke to Peter. Then it is likely that the other two Apostles, who had been united with Peter in special companionship with their Master, conceived the idea of holding a higher place in the future kingdom than that Apostle. This would be all the more likely to occur if Jesus, as the Fourth Evangelist relates, exhibited special love to John. St Mark relates (ix. 35) how our Lord rebuked these disputes ; but they were revived by this request of the sons of Zebedee, which elicited from our Lord a new declaration of the conditions for greatness in His kingdom.

St Luke, who wrote at a time when probably the leading men in the Church wished that these ancient disputes should be forgotten, has not told of the ambition of the sons of Zebedee, and he has combined the rebukes with which our Lord more than once suppressed those seething rivalries, springing from the expectation of a temporal kingdom, into one discourse which he places on the night before our Lord's apprehension. What is most astonishing is the perfect success of this teaching, and the complete absence of personal emulation among those who, after their Master's death, governed His Church. The light cast by the Evangelists on the

contests which arose during the brief season of expected triumph, enables us to see how different the history of Christ's kingdom might have been, if it had not been for that rejection and defeat, which seemed to the disciples shocking and incredible when their Master announced it to them.

THE HEALING OF THE BLIND MAN AT JERICHO

MARK x. 46-52.

MATT. xx. 29-34.

LUKE xviii. 35-43.

There can be no doubt that St Luke's narrative here is dependent on St Mark's, with which it has close verbal resemblance. The first difference we find that is not merely verbal is that St Mark gives the name of the blind man, and that St Luke does not. But no explanation is necessary save that St Luke wrote for readers who would be interested in hearing how Jesus had restored a blind man to sight, without caring to know his name or his father's; while we have no right to demand that St Mark should suppress a detail which he remembered, even if we do not make the quite credible hypothesis that this man, on being restored to sight, remained in the company of our Lord's disciples, among whom his name became a familiar word.

St Mark here gives a graphic narrative how Jesus stopped, ordered the blind man to be called; and how the man at once jumped up, cast off his garment, and came. St Luke has substantially the same story to tell, only with less detail. It is only in the final clause that St Luke makes a substantial addition, telling that the blind man followed in the way *glorifying God*, and that *all the people, when they saw it, gave praise unto God*. But these additions are not enough to establish the conclusion that St Luke here used a different authority.

St Luke has here deviated from Mark, in relating

this miracle as performed as our Lord was going into Jericho, not as He was coming out. St Luke has evidently some information independent of Mark; for he goes on to tell of the reception of our Lord in Jericho by Zacchæus, who may well have been, directly or indirectly, the source of St Luke's information. I find no necessity for making a reconciliation between St Mark's account and St Luke's. Both accounts agree in placing the scene of the miracle in the neighbourhood of Jericho. St Matthew's account, however, requires a closer examination, because it presents what may perhaps be regarded as a "doublet"; that is to say, there is another account of the healing a blind man which has so many points of resemblance to that under consideration that the question arises whether both are not accounts of the same occurrence. I place first that the place of which in the narrative gives probability to the theory that St Matthew has derived his account from Mark.

MATT. xx. 29-34.

Καὶ ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Ἱερειχῶς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς, καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ. ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μείζον ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ. καὶ στὰς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ἐφώνησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἶπεν, Τί θέλετε ποιῶσω ὑμῖν; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἵνα ἀνοιγῶσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν. σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἥψατο τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐτῶν, καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέβλεψαν καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

MATT. ix. 27-31.

Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκείθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠκολούθησαν δύο τυφλοὶ κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ. ἐλθόντι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν προσήλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ τυφλοὶ, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πιστεύετε ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ναί, κύριε. τότε ἥψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν λέγων, Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γεννηθήτω ὑμῖν. καὶ ἠνεψύχθησαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί. Καὶ ἐνεβριμήθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων, Ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω· οἱ δὲ ἐξεληθόντες διεφήμισαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ γῇ ἐκείνῃ.

The story in Matthew xx. is in close verbal identity with that told by St Mark. The chief difference is that St Matthew tells the story of two blind men; that he omits, as St Luke does, the relation of the encouraging tone in which our Lord's call¹ was conveyed to the blind man, and of his then jumping up, throwing aside his garment and running to Jesus. St Matthew has the phrase *that our eyes may be opened*, instead of Mark's

¹ φωνεῖν is not used by St Matthew except where copied from Mark.

that I may receive my sight, and the word *σπλαγχνισθεῖς* is also Matthew's.

But the story in Matt. ix. must be referred, not to Mark, but to the Aramaic Matthew. It may be a question whether the Greek translator has not modified it. The story is told by St Matthew as immediately following the raising of Jairus' daughter ; but if we take our chronology from Mark, we should place at a later date the ascription to our Lord of the title *Son of David*. The command also that no man should be told of the miracle appears to belong to a later period in our Lord's life, though it must be owned that the argument is precarious. The Aramaic story no doubt related a miracle performed on two blind men, which may account for the duplication in St Matthew's account of the miracle in chap. xx. There is no reason for rejecting St Mark's account, which seems to rest on autoptic testimony, that there was only one, nor need we try to save St Matthew's infallibility by the hypothesis that one man had been met when our Lord was going into Jericho, and another as He was coming out.

THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY

MARK xi. 1-II.

Καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίξουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν πρὸς τὸ Ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐθὺς εἰσπορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν· λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, Τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἰπατε, Ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει· καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὡδε, κ.τ.λ.

MATT. xxi. 1-II.

Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Βηθφαγὴ εἰς τὸ Ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, τότε Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς λέγων αὐτοῖς, Πορεύεσθε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐθὺς εὐρήσετε ὄνον δεδεμένον καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς· λύσαντες ἀγάγετέ μοι. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ τι, ἐρεῖτε ὅτι, Ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν χρεῖαν ἔχει· εὐθὺς δὲ ἀποστέλλει αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ.

LUKE xix. 28-40.

Καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν, ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθητῶν λέγων, Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην, ἐν ᾗ εἰσπορευόμενοι εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν, καὶ λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ, Διὰ τί λύετε; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ὅτι, Ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει, κ.τ.λ.

Origen tells us in his Commentary on St Matthew (tom. xvi. 17) that St Matthew herè has Βηθφαγή, Mark Βηθανιάς, Luke Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανιάς. This statement as regards the readings of Matthew and Luke agrees with the extant MSS.; but those of Mark, including B and \aleph , give the same reading as Luke, Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανιά [ν]. Moreover Origen, in his Commentary on St John (tom. x. 15), copies this whole section of Mark in the form agreeing with the now Received Text. Having regard to the explicit statement of Origen just quoted, Tischendorf suspects that the MSS. of the Commentary on St John must be in error; but I rather think the true explanation to be that the Commentary on St John represents the text of Mark in the form accepted in Alexandria, and that the Commentary on St Matthew, written a dozen years later, when Origen was residing in Palestine, represents to us the Western MS. used by Origen at that later time. Holding as I do the opinion that St Luke made use of St Mark's Gospel, I regard St Luke as attesting the more ancient reading of Mark. I think that the Aramaic Matthew had *Bethphage*; and that St Mark's local knowledge added *Bethany*, which was the real scene of the incident.

Another various reading deserves attention: in Mark xi. 3, Jesus instructs His two disciples, in case any one should ask them why they loosed the colt, to reply, *The Lord hath need of him*, and then, according to the Received Text, He goes on to predict that this answer would obtain immediate compliance, *and straightway he will send him hither*. But B and the other witnesses to the older text instead of καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστέλει αὐτὸν ὧδε, have καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε. That is to say, this clause becomes part of the reply put into the disciples' mouths: *The Lord hath need of him, and will immediately send him back again hither*. It certainly weakens the miraculous impression produced by the predicted success of the demand, when we learn that no more was asked for than a loan with the promise of immediate return. It is not surprising, then, that St Luke though, as I

believe, deriving his story from Mark, should omit this clause altogether.

When we compare the forms with and without *πάλιν*, I regard the former as having the claim to higher antiquity; because if the *πάλιν* had not been in the original text, there appears no inducement for adding it; while, on the other hand, it is quite conceivable that though part of the original, it might have been left out on subsequent repetition of the story. My theory is that the form without *πάλιν* and with the future tense appeared first in the text of the Greek Matthew,¹ which I take to be some years later than Mark; and that subsequently copies of St Mark's Gospel were altered into conformity with St Matthew's text.

We might suppose that the men who lent the colt were strangers to our Lord; but as the place was Bethany, where our Lord had friends with whom He afterwards went out to sleep, it may well be believed that they knew who *ὁ κύριος* was. A quite parallel case is that of our Lord's sending two disciples to prepare a room for the Passover feast. [St Matthew tells the story as if the disciples were directed to go to a particular person.] St Mark, followed by St Luke, sends them to one apparently selected by chance. We need not anticipate the discussion as to which of these versions of the story is to be preferred, but the question is certainly raised in both cases as to the liability of a simple story to receive ornamental additions.

A notable difference in St Matthew's account is that whereas St Mark, St Luke, and St John tell of our Lord's riding on a single animal (and indeed it is hard to understand how He could have ridden two, except in the sense that He rode one, and the other followed). St Matthew tells that the ass and her foal were brought to our Lord, and He is represented as sitting *upon them*. St Matthew's language seems intended to bring the narrative into closer verbal conformity with the prophecy

¹ It seems to me that St Matthew understood the passage in Mark in the same way that an ordinary reader understands our English version.

*Upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.*¹ Indeed St Mark's account excludes the idea of our Lord's riding on the mother ass; for he lays stress on the fact, which St Matthew omits, that the animal was one on which none before had sat; a thing likely to be true of the colt, but scarcely of the mother.

The point deserves notice that St Mark makes no mention of the prophecy of Zechariah. I suppose the explanation of this to be that St Mark wrote for Gentile readers in whom he could not assume acquaintance with the Jewish prophets. Illustrations of the fulfilment of prophecy, such as St Matthew often notes, must have been dwelt on in Christian preaching from the earliest date of it; and though no doubt, as time went on, this topic was likely to be expanded, yet it is not likely to have been absent at any date however early.

Now it seems to me that the reference to Zechariah in the present Matthew is likely to have been in the earliest form of that Gospel. It must surely have been in the mind of the disciples when they joined in the triumphal entry. We are expressly given to understand that the colt on which our Lord rode had not borne Him from the north, but was specially obtained for the express purpose of this entry. When it is said that *the Lord hath need of him*, it cannot be supposed that it was for the mere purpose of carrying Him for the short remaining journey to Jerusalem, when He had come so much greater a distance without using its services; and therefore we are bound to suppose that the *need* was that of the fulfilment of prophecy. That St Luke has not here quoted the prophecy of Zechariah, leads, I think, to the inference that St Luke here uses no authority but Mark. The Fourth Evangelist certainly used both St Mark's Gospel and St Luke's; and I take it that it was their silence about the prophecy which elicited the remark (John xii. 16), that the disciples did not understand at the first what they were doing;

¹ The R. V. of Zech. ix. 9 renders *even upon a colt*.

and that it was not till after Jesus was glorified that they observed the conformity of their actions with prophecy.

With regard to the conduct of the Pharisees on this occasion, we have to distinguish the statements of the different Evangelists. St Mark makes no mention of the presence of Pharisees in our Lord's triumphant procession; and in fact we should not expect to find them there. The Pharisees of Jerusalem were not likely to have been previously informed of the intended arrival of the Galilean prophet and His retinue. St Matthew relates (xxi. 10), that the procession, when it reached the streets, took the people of Jerusalem by surprise, and set them enquiring *Who is this?* According to St Matthew, it was not on the roads, but in the Temple, to which our Lord paid His first visit, that offence was taken by the chief priests and scribes at the children who cried *Hosanna to the Son of David*, as well as at the casting of the traders out of the Temple. We should have concluded from St Matthew's narrative that this took place on the very evening of His arrival. But St Mark places the casting out of the traffickers on the next day; and seems to imply that on the first evening He had only looked round, and that His official visit was not made until the following day. As St Luke tells the story, the Pharisees would seem to have been members of the crowd in the procession; but St Luke has certainly compressed the story as told by St Mark, making no mention of the acclamations of the children in the Temple. The conclusion I draw from these facts is that the Aramaic Gospel had contained an account substantially in the form given in the Greek Matthew: that is to say, in which the Pharisees were mentioned, not as members of the triumphal procession, but as scandalised by the acclamations of the children, and our Lord as replying to them in the words of the eighth Psalm. St Mark's account does not contradict this; and St Luke seems to have but made a literary compression of

Matthew and Mark, and does not show possession of fuller historical information.

I habitually confine my discussion to the Synoptic Gospels, because however useful the Fourth Gospel is as a commentary, written by one with special sources of information, it is certainly of later date than the Synoptics, and represents the story believed at a somewhat later time. Whenever that Gospel relates anything not contained in the Synoptics, the credibility of additions to the original story requires separate examination. In the present case, St John adopts St Luke's account that Pharisees were present at the triumphal procession; which, however, according to him consisted exclusively of Galileans. His solution is that the miracle of the raising of Lazarus had made such a sensation that a great number of those who had come up for the feast, hearing that our Lord was coming in from Bethany went out to meet Him.

St Matthew and St Mark had stated that it was at the village at the foot of the Mount of Olives that our Lord mounted the ass; and St Luke here states that it was at the descent of the Mount of Olives that the acclamations were raised.

THE BARREN FIG TREE

MARK xi. 12-14.

MATT. xxi. 18, 19.

The incident of the fig tree is omitted by St Luke, but copied by St Matthew. According to Matthew and Luke, our Lord's cleansing of the Temple might be attributed to an outburst of indignation at seeing the house of prayer wearing the aspect of a market in which a stirring traffic was carried on. I attribute it to St Peter's accurate recollection that St Mark is able to tell that our Lord, on His first visit, only looked round and observed the state of the holy place, but

that next morning He came in, resolved to use the authority which the multitude were willing to acknowledge in setting things right. And St Mark circumstantially relates that it was only on His way into the city that the incident of the barren fig tree took place.

The Evangelist John tells that the disciples did not understand at the time all that was meant by the triumphal entry. Still less were they likely to apprehend the lesson taught by this incident. Afterwards when so many loud professions of allegiance failed in the hour of trial, they must have been struck by the contrast between leaves and fruit. Probably another lesson may be taught by the fact, that since we are told that it is the nature of the fig tree to produce the fruit before the leaves, this fig tree may have been one which already had had fruit, though it had none now. It is easy to see that a lesson may be drawn from the fact that the tree was cursed, whose only merit was that it *once* had fruit. Perhaps I may have been wrong in supposing that it was last season's figs which it was expected might be still remaining on the tree. It may have been a tree brought forward too early by a mild season, and which, if in leaf, might be supposed to have fruit. The abnormal thing about this tree was the presence of leaves, not the absence of fruit. The symbolic force of the parable remains the same, representing the contrast between the professed piety of the nation and its practical irreligion; and no doubt the thought must have been present of the contrast between the eager allegiance of our Lord's followers, and what was foreseen of their desertion.

I am disposed to think that the story of the barren fig tree was no part of the original Gospel, which I take to be the Aramaic Matthew. I consider that we have in Mark the story as it was circumstantially told by St Peter, who relates the casting out of the traffickers as not taking place till the following day; but who tells, in order, how the barrenness of the

tree was noticed as our Lord was going in to the city in the morning, and its withering not until the next morning. St Matthew, following the order of his original, places the cleansing of the Temple on the first evening; and then, taking up St Mark's narrative, is obliged to deviate from St Mark's order.

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE

MARK xi. 15-18.

MATT. xxi. 12-17.

LUKE xix. 45-48.

Though I do not treat of the Fourth Gospel, I cannot help taking notice of the fact that that Gospel places this incident at the very commencement of our Lord's ministry, while the Synoptics place it at the very close. This puts a testing strain on our belief in the infallibility of the Gospels. In this and in some other cases, even those who do not profess to maintain their infallibility, would much dislike to have to say boldly that the Synoptics are right and St John wrong. Yet the only other way of maintaining the absolute accuracy of both accounts, viz., that there had been two cleansings, does not commend itself to me; though I readily admit that if our Lord on a second visit found the same improprieties which had shocked Him before, He would naturally express His indignation in the same way. We are therefore not entitled to regard the present case as one of real contradiction between John and the Synoptics. If, however, there was only one cleansing, the Synoptics clearly place it at the right time. Our Lord had come up to Jerusalem accompanied by enthusiastic adherents, with whom His reputation was well established, not only by a lengthened course of public teaching, but by many mighty works. It might have been no easy matter then to dispute His authority, especially when the feelings of pious men would readily sympathise with His righteous

indignation. But an unknown teacher coming up for the first time would not find his interference so easily acquiesced in.

This then, is a branch of the wider difference between St John and the Synoptics, that the latter tell only of our Lord's presence at that Passover during which His life was taken; whereas the Fourth Gospel would lead us to believe that our Lord habitually attended the feasts in Jerusalem, and consequently was well known there as a teacher. We cannot speak very positively on this point without more information than we now possess as to whether it was at this period practically felt to be a matter of obligation that *every* Jew should attend the Jerusalem feasts. We need no other authority than the Acts to know that these annual feasts were times of gathering of Jews from all parts of the world; but it is not credible that every Jew went up to Jerusalem three times in the year; and it may well be believed that, in most individual cases, these visits to Jerusalem, instead of being paid annually, were made at irregular intervals. Our first idea would be that our Lord would set an example of punctilious observance of all the requirements of the Mosaic law; yet we have no distinct evidence that He did; and it is quite possible that He may have judged that this was not the direction in which people needed to be urged, who were so constantly apt to satisfy themselves with the external and the trivial, while neglecting the inward and the important. So that we cannot tell whether One who was deemed by strict Jews to be lax in respect of Sabbath observance may not also have come short of their requirements in respect of attendance at feasts.

Postponing the question whether St John is not right in representing our Lord as no stranger in Jerusalem, or whether St Matthew (xxi. 10) would not lead us to think that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were unacquainted with Him, and needed to be taught by the acclaiming multitude that *He was the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth*

of *Galilee*, there still remains a minor difference between St John and the Synoptics. The latter represent the triumphal procession as but an incident in our Lord's journey from the north, whereas St John would lead us to think of our Lord as having come up some time before to Bethany for the sake of Lazarus, and as having after that gone no further off than a city called Ephraim. In short, St John makes Bethany the starting-point of the triumphal procession, instead of its being merely a place at which our Lord arrived on His way to Jerusalem.

It is an interesting question how long our Lord was teaching in the Temple on His last visit to the city. St Mark's imperfect tenses would lead us to think of some tolerable length of time. With respect to the expulsion from the Temple of the traffickers, instead of ἐξέβαλεν, he has ἡρξάτο ἐκβάλλειν, in which he is copied by St Luke. The cleansing of the Temple, then, as related by St Mark, was not a single act, but an ordinance enforced by our Lord on those who submitted to His authority, as long as they did so. We have the imperfects ἡφίεν, ἐδίδασκεν, ἔλεγεν, that is to say, He habitually did not permit vessels to be carried through the Temple; it was not merely once that He said, *My house shall be called a house of prayer*, but this was the Scripture authority by which He enforced His ordinance. It is a plain sign of posteriority in St Matthew that he turns all these imperfects into aorists, and makes the history one merely of a single act of authority. St Luke retains much of St Mark's language; but while he leaves it undetermined whether there was more than a single expulsion of buyers and sellers, he makes the interpretation of ἐδίδασκεν unmistakable, substituting for this imperfect tense ἡν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. We are not bound to believe that this continuous course of action lasted only four or five days. We are at liberty to accept St John's account, that our Lord made His first protest against Temple profanation on an earlier visit to the sacred House, and to believe that

after an absence of a year or more, coming back with a number of Galilean disciples, He enforced His requirements more vigorously. There is thus no harmonistic difficulty in reconciling John and Mark.

As to the duration of the last visit to Jerusalem, the fixing of the triumphal entry for the Sunday before the Crucifixion seems to me to depend rather on ecclesiastical than on Scripture authority, save that no doubt the ecclesiastical dates exhibit the way in which the Scriptures were understood at the time that dates for commemoration were fixed. In the Synoptic Gospels, the only date specified is the time that the Sanhedrim resolved on the death of Jesus, which is stated to have been *two days before the Passover* (Matt. xxvi. 2 ; Mark xiv. 1). There must have been some days of public teaching previously (whether on this or on a former visit) such as to convince the Jewish authorities that this Galilean prophet was a dangerous person who had gained so much influence among the people already, and was likely to gain so much more, that it was to be apprehended that He might raise an insurrection which might endanger the existence of the nation. How many days of public teaching there were the Evangelists have not told us. We should certainly suppose that the Galilean pilgrims did not commence their journey so early as to make it necessary for them to spend a long time in Jerusalem before the feast. When St Mark has told of our Lord's arrival in Jerusalem, and of His teaching in the Temple, he goes on to say (xii. 1) that He *began to speak unto them in parables*. But we can lay no stress on this word *began*, it being, as I have already pointed out, St Mark's usual formula when a continuous course of action is mentioned for the first time. St Luke merely tells us that the challenge of the scribes to our Lord, to tell them by what authority He acted, was made *on one of the days, as He was teaching in the Temple*. St Matthew is equally indefinite, though he confirms St Mark's account that it was not merely one parable that was spoken on this occasion ;

and he has preserved for us the parable of the man who directed his two sons to work in his vineyard.

The Jewish rulers must be acknowledged to have had good grounds for apprehension as to the disposition of our Lord's followers. It was evident that, in the view of these disciples, a crisis had arrived. They evidently meant nothing less than a proclamation of His sovereignty when they brought Him in, riding in the manner in which it had been predicted that the King should arrive, and hailing Him with acclamations of *Hosanna to the Son of David*, which resounded in the Temple itself. Unless the rulers were prepared to accept Him as their King, and under His command to embark in a rebellion against Rome, in the success of which they had no belief, these treasonable cries could not be permitted.

Jesus was then asked whether His disciples had His sanction for claiming the honours which they were ascribing to Him; and when He fully accepted them, it became, in the minds of the rulers, a political necessity to destroy Him. The Fourth Evangelist very clearly describes (xi. 48) what must have been the natural feelings of a prudent magistrate: *If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him; and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation.* The only difference is that St John describes these sentiments as excited by the raising of Lazarus some weeks earlier, a fact with which the Synoptic Evangelists show no acquaintance. Regarding, as I do, our written Gospels as but records of the narratives delivered *viva voce* by the first witnesses, I feel no distress at ordinary omissions, or discrepancies, which are sufficiently accounted for by the necessarily fragmentary character of the records of the narratives which have been preserved. Yet I do feel that the absence from the Synoptics of any mention of the raising of Lazarus is a great stumbling-block. This is an event which, according to St John's account, made

a great sensation, and which we should imagine nobody who knew of it would omit.

The Fourth Evangelist seems to me to have known the localities, and to have had some trustworthy sources of information. Yet all agree that his account is later than that of the Synoptics, and I have not always confidence in accepting additions which he makes to the previously published story. The best theory I can make about him is that he was the Apostle John's "hermeneutes" and assistant, with whom that Apostle could not dispense, even if he knew Greek, as he probably did. For an Eastern might be able to understand Greek, and even to speak it well enough for commercial purposes, and yet not feel himself competent to address an audience in that language. It remains for enquiry whether this assistant was not capable of ornamenting or making additions to the stories he heard from the Apostle. But in the present case, the Fourth Evangelist gives no countenance to an idea which had suggested itself to me, that our Lord might have been on this occasion some days in Jerusalem teaching those who had come up to purify themselves for the Feast. And, on reflection, I see that such a supposition must be rejected; for the whole effect of the triumphal entry would have been lost if Jesus had been publicly in Jerusalem for any time before. And after the entry, things would proceed very rapidly: the enthusiasm of His adherents, the cries of Hosanna, the apprehensions of the rulers, and the resolve to deliver this pretender to the Romans.

It is from the Fourth Evangelist that the received ecclesiastical dates have been derived. St John dates our Lord's coming to Bethany as *six days before the Passover*. It is not likely that He would travel on the Sabbath, so that Sunday is the earliest available date for His coming to Bethany; and as this Evangelist makes Friday the day of the Passover, we have the six days made out, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. One passage in St John's Gospel

seems to me to have been overlooked in this calculation, *i.e.*, John xii. 12, which places the triumphal entry *on the morrow* after the arrival at Bethany, that is to say, only on the Monday. I have no time to examine how this statement of St John's is explained away, beyond saying that it seems to me that those who fixed this day for ecclesiastical purposes did not accept this statement, but followed the Synoptic Evangelists in placing it before the supper at Bethany. I think that the account of this supper, of which I shall have presently to speak, formed part of the "primitive Gospel" which, as I take it, was the Aramaic Matthew.

St Mark describes those who were offended at our Lord's citation of Psalm viii. 2 as οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. St Luke in the parallel passage (xix. 47) plainly copied from Mark, adds καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ. We are told here, for the first time in the Synoptic Gospels, of the hostility of the chief priests to our Lord, but His interference where the Temple was concerned might well provoke their opposition.

THE CONTINUATION OF THE STORY OF THE FIG TREE.

MARK xi. 19-25 (26, A.V.).

MATT. xxi. 20-22.

Compare also the reason given for the ill-success of the disciples in dealing with the epileptic, Matt. xvii. 20, a passage not given in the corresponding section of Mark. Compare also our Lord's answer, Luke xvii. 6, to the disciples' prayer, *Increase our Faith*.

MARK xi. 19.

MATT. xxi. 17.

Καὶ ὅταν ὁ ψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο
ἐξω τῆς πόλεως.

Καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἐξω
τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἠύλισθη
ἐκεῖ.

St Matthew here alters Mark's imperfect ἐξεπορεύοντο into aorists. St Mark clearly means us to understand that our Lord's regular custom on those days was to teach in the Temple by day, and go out of the city in the evening.

None of the other Evangelists states so emphatically

the doctrine that you can get anything by prayer, if you only ask with full confidence that your prayer will be granted. Disappointments must have occurred so often that we can well believe that those who reported our Lord's sayings *viva voce*, or in writing, would be tempted to soften down so strong a saying.

The principle incorporated in the Lord's prayer, as we have it now, that we have no right to ask for forgiveness from God, if we do not ourselves forgive those who have offended against us, is implied also in Matt. xviii. 21 and the following verses. But the connexion here is less obvious. Yet both here and in the passage in Matthew, just referred to, the same account can be given. When our Lord teaches the omnipotence of prayer, He feels it necessary to give a caution, lest the disciples should use prayer to avenge their own wrongs by invoking a curse on those who had offended them. So on this solitary occasion of our Lord's invoking a curse, He cautions His disciples that the spirit which would seek vengeance on another is incompatible with the obtaining forgiveness of the punishment to which our own sins had made us liable.

THE CHALLENGE OF OUR LORD'S AUTHORITY

MARK xi. 27, 28.

Καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατούντος αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, Ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; ἢ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς;

MATT. xxi. 23.

Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσήλθαν αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ λέγοντες, Ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καὶ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;

LUKE xx. 1, 2.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ εἶπαν λέγοντες πρὸς αὐτόν, Εἰπὼν ἡμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, ἢ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ δοὺς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην.

It is evident here that St Matthew and St Luke have a common authority independent of Mark. St Mark tells that this challenge was made to our Lord when He

was walking in the Temple, St Matthew and St Luke agree in saying that it was while He was teaching there, and Luke adds καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου. Matthew and Luke also agree in using a simpler form of question than Mark's pleonastic, *By what authority doest thou these things? or who gave thee this authority to do these things?* It is no doubt possible that the other two Evangelists might, if both used Mark, have independently simplified his form of expression; but I prefer to believe that the whole section that commences here was to be found in an authority older than Mark, used by all three Synoptics.

It cannot be said that this challenge of our Lord's authority was quite unprovoked, for it was rather He and His disciples who had challenged the constituted authorities. That He did exercise authority is evident; and it was natural that He should be asked in what capacity He claimed it. Those who put the question were not casual witnesses of His acts; but a formal deputation from the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders of the people.

We are not right in regarding this question as one put by captious opponents anxious to puzzle Him; such as that put by the Sadducees, as to whom a man, who had married more wives than one, would have as his wife in the resurrection. The present was a question which prudent rulers were well justified in putting. If it was only as a prophet that He exercised His authority, ecclesiastical tribunals might investigate His claim; but undoubtedly it was as King that many of His followers were paying Him homage; and if He accepted it in that capacity, a collision with the Roman Government would be inevitable if the Jewish magistrates permitted such an agitation to go on unchecked. Yet the question, if only intended to embarrass our Lord, was well calculated to produce that effect, obliging Him either to throw cold water on the enthusiasm of His followers, or else to encourage a zeal which threatened to be dangerous.

OUR LORD'S REPLY TO THE CHALLENGE OF HIS AUTHORITY

MARK xi. 29, 30.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς ἓνα λόγον, καὶ ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι, καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ· τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι.

MATT. xxi. 24, 25a.

Ἀποκριθεὶς [δὲ] ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ λόγον ἓνα, ὃν ἐὰν εἴπητέ μοι καὶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ· τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;

LUKE xx. 3, 4.

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ λόγον, καὶ εἵπατέ μοι, Τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;

Thus far we may notice two points in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark, not very important, but which still must be taken notice of as confirming the conclusion at which we had already arrived, that in this section the other two Evangelists are not dependent on Mark, but that all are following a common Lord's reply. The two points are, the beginning of our Lord's reply with ἀποκριθεὶς, and the καὶ γὰρ.

MARK xi. 31-33.

Καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες, Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ, Διὰ τί [οὖν] οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;—ἐφοβούντο τὸν ὄχλον, ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. καὶ ἀποκριθέντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγουσιν, Οὐκ οἶδμεν. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.

MATT. xxi. 25b-27.

Οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες, Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν, Διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον, πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην· καὶ ἀποκριθέντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπαν, Οὐκ οἶδαμεν. ἔφη αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτός, Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.

LUKE xx. 5-8.

Οἱ δὲ συνέλογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες ὅτι, Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ, Διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ὁ λαὸς ἅπας καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς, πεπεισμένους γὰρ ἔστιν Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι· καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι πόθεν. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.

In this, as in other instances; the relation between Matthew and Mark is one of simple copying, while St Luke has attempted to tell the story in his own words.

MARK xi. 32.—There is here an anacoluthon in Mark; and the other two Evangelists seem to show their dependence on Mark by correcting this: St Matthew somewhat unskilfully, St Luke in an abler manner; St Mark has *But should we say, From men—they feared*

the multitude. St Matthew removes the grammatical awkwardness, *If we shall say, From men, we fear the multitude*; yet was it likely that they should make such frank confession of their cowardice? St Luke puts it in a form which they might conceivably have used, *All the people will stone us.*

A careless reader might imagine that Jesus here avoided, by a clumsy evasion, to answer the question put to Him, namely, by asking another irrelevant question. But His question was not irrelevant. We know from St John's Gospel that our Lord's first disciples were led to join Him in consequence of the testimony borne Him by John the Baptist; and to this the same Evangelist represents our Lord as Himself referring (John v. 33-36). The testimony borne by John to our Lord is related in the earliest record of the preaching of John (Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 7; Luke iii. 16). One mightier than himself was to come after him. The present passage shows that the Baptist's testimony was known not only to the disciples, but to the Jewish rulers, for they were well aware of the retort to which they would be liable if they acknowledged the authority of the Baptist.

Our Lord's mode of dealing with the challenge made Him, must have completely satisfied His immediate hearers, the majority of whom had long recognised John as a prophet, who knew that our Lord's opponents would alienate general sympathy if they did not recognise it too, and who did not need that the topic should be developed at length, that the acceptance of John necessarily involved the acknowledgment of the authority of Jesus. But if our Lord thus gained a logical victory, His opponents obtained a political success. The report brought back by the deputation must have convinced the rulers of the necessity of putting a check on teaching which threatened to be dangerous. This new prophet, who was exercising semi-royal authority, was loudly hailed as King by enthusiastic followers, and He did not decline their

homage; when asked to silence the children who announced His regal dignity, He refused; now when given the opportunity of saying whether He put on any lower grounds the authority which He exercised, He evaded the question. What other judgment could they form than that a rebellion against Roman rule was contemplated, of which Jesus was to be the head, but which sober judgment condemned as doomed to failure, disastrous not only to the ringleaders, but to the nation?

THE PARABLE OF THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN

MARK xii. 1a.

Καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν
παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν.

MATT. xxi. 33a.

Ἄλλην παραβολὴν
ἀκούσατε.

LUKE xx. 9a.

ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν
λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβο-
λὴν ταύτην.

St Matthew has just related the parable of the man who bade his two sons work in his vineyard, a parable not recorded by St Mark. He therefore could not use Mark's ἤρξατο. St Luke copies the ἤρξατο; but, if it is not too audacious a thing to say, I do not think he understood St Mark's use of this formula. There is no precedent in Mark for *He began to speak THIS parable*. Luke tempts us to ask, If He only began to speak this parable, how did He go on? St Mark here only gives one parable, and St Luke copies that one. But St Matthew here gives three; viz., he prefixes the story of the man who had two sons—the one obedient in word, the other in deed—and he adds the story of the king who made the marriage feast. The question arises, Were the three parables in the common source of Matthew and Mark? or did St Matthew, in copying Mark, fill up his bare outline with details which he found elsewhere, and which he thought could be advantageously placed here? We have a parallel case

St Matthew's version is a real abridgment of St Mark's, but gives no idea that he is drawing from any different source. St Luke is drawing directly from Mark; like him, he mentions the successive sending of three servants, but does not narrate the subsequent sending of many others. According to St Mark's account, it would seem that it was only the third messenger who was killed; those sent previously having been only wounded. St Luke does not tell of the killing of any before the Master's own Son. I attribute this to St Luke's freedom of narration, and not to the use of a different source.

MARK xii. 6-11.

Ἐτι ἓνα εἶχεν, υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι, Ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι, Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία. καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. τί ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις. Οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε, Δίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν;

MATT. xxi. 37-42.

Ἵστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων, Ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ· καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκείνοις; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Κακοὺς κακοὺς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς, καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐκδώσεται ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες ἀποδώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, Δίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν;

LUKE xx. 13-17.

Ἐἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, Τί ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἵσως τοῦτον ἐντραπήσονται. ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κληρονομία· καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἀπέκτειναν. τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς τούτους, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις. ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἶπαν, Μὴ γένοιτο. ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπεν, Τί οὖν ἐστὶν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο, Δίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας;

St Luke and St Mark here agree in adding to υἱόν the adjective ἀγαπητόν. St Luke, I think, has Mark for his sole authority, but St Matthew also makes use of an authority independent of Mark. All the

same, St Matthew verbally follows Mark with wonderful closeness. The ἀγαπητός seems to have been suggested by Isaiah v. 1. St Luke's use of Isaiah is made still plainer by the continuation τί ποιήσω (Isaiah v. 4). St Mark speaks of the husbandmen without expression of censure; St Matthew cannot restrain his indignation: the husbandmen are γεωργοὶς ἐκείνοις, and again, κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς, and they are contrasted with the other husbandmen, who will render the fruits in their season. It may be doubted whether the τούτους in Luke's τοὺς γεωργοὺς τούτους represents some word corresponding to Matthew's ἐκείνοις in the common original, or whether the addition of some such word is but a natural literary improvement. The ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν in Matthew takes up the καιρός, with which, in all three Evangelists, the parable begins.

We note also the difference that according to Mark, the answer to the question τί ποιήσει is given by our Lord Himself; in Matthew by the hearers. The explanation seems to be that the τί ποιήσει in Mark is merely rhetorical, and that St Matthew regarded it as a question put to the Pharisees, their answer to which must be recorded. St Luke agrees with St Matthew in representing the quotation from the Psalms as elicited by something said by the hearers, but he represents them as at once catching the meaning of our Lord's words, and interrupting with μὴ γένοιτο. In St Matthew's account, our Lord Himself is represented as bringing out the full meaning of the parable.

MATT. xxi. 43.

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς.

We have every reason to adhere to St Mark's simple narrative, leaving out this addition of St Matthew's, and also the μὴ γένοιτο, for the introduction of which St Luke has no support from the other two Evangelists. St Luke, however, makes another addition at the end.

LUKE xx. 18.

Πῶς ὁ πεσὼν ἐπ' ἐκείνων τὸν λίθον συνθλασθήσεται
ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν.

It is a very nice question of textual criticism whether this addition has not also the support of Matthew. An overwhelming amount of the Greek testimony, including B^s, adds Matt. xxi. 44, which verbally agrees with Luke xx. 18, except that for ἐπ' ἐκείνων τὸν λίθον Matthew has ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον. The case for omission in Matthew rests mainly on D and on Old Latin versions. References by Origen leave it doubtful whether he is quoting Matthew or Luke; but Origen sometimes used Western MSS., and if the disputed words are not genuine, they must be counted as among what Westcott and Hort call "Western non-interpolations." Without any theory, the fact may be admitted that a text of Matthew which did not contain the words in question was at one time in circulation, though it would seem not in extensive circulation. We may safely conclude that they were not in the Aramaic Matthew. It seems to me probable that the verse in dispute came from Luke; but, even if it were so, that we know too little of the comparative dates to be certain, even on that supposition, that it could not have been part of the Greek Gospel from the first.

MARK xii. 12.

Καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν κρα-
τῆσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν
τὸν ὄχλον, ἔγνωσαν γὰρ
ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παρα-
βολὴν εἶπεν. καὶ ἀφέντες
αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθαν.

MATT. xxi. 45, 46.

Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ἁρ-
χιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
τὰς παραβολὰς αὐτοῦ ἔγ-
νωσαν ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν
λέγει· καὶ ζητοῦντες αὐ-
τὸν κρατῆσαι ἐφοβήθησαν
τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπεὶ εἰς προ-
φήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

LUKE xx. 19.

Καὶ ἐξήτησαν οἱ γραμ-
ματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς
ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς
χεῖρας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ,
καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαόν,
ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐ-
τοὺς εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν
ταύτην.

Note St Mark's care of his imperfects in ἐξήτουν, and St Luke's indifference in ἐξήτησαν. *They sought* was certainly a continuous act.

There appeared now no reason to doubt the seditious designs of our Lord's followers, and no reason to expect that He would Himself disclaim the dangerous title of King, which they were offering Him. On the contrary,

He braved the hostility of the rulers ; for the only interpretation of His parable was that in anticipation of their designs against Himself, He was charging them with being the habitual murderers of God's messengers. They decided, therefore, that it was a political necessity to remove Him ; and now they *were seeking* how to lay hold on Him without raising a popular tumult. Either they must elicit some utterance from Him which would alienate from Him the sympathy of the people ; or else they must find means to apprehend Him in the absence of the people. The former plan they first tried, and they failed ; in the latter they succeeded.

THE TRIBUTE MONEY

MARK xii. 13-17.

MATT. xxii. 15-22.

LUKE xx. 20-26.

In place of St Mark's *φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον*, St Matthew and St Luke substitute for *φέρετε*, which is scarcely suitable, *ἐπιδείξατε* and *δείξατε* respectively. But possibly St Mark represents the testimony of an eye-witness who had seen that the denarius had to be sought and brought.

It must be pointed out, in the first place, that this question about the tribute money had no connexion with that previously put as to our Lord's claim to the authority which He was exercising. The questions were put by different persons and at different times. The question about our Lord's authority was put officially, viz., by the chief priests and the elders, or members of the ruling body ; it was only after He had evaded answering it that the Pharisees took counsel how they might destroy Him, and got the Herodians to join them in putting to Him, as private men, a still more embarrassing question. The reason for calling attention to the fact that one of these interviews was quite distinct from the other is that light is here cast

on St Matthew's method of working, in putting different anecdotes together, and on his probable dependence on Mark. St Matthew copies verbally the words with which St Mark closes his account of the first interview (*καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθαν*), and puts them at the end of the second, viz., this one about the tribute money.

That the question was really put, not for the purpose of obtaining information, but of ensnaring our Lord, is assumed by all the Evangelists, who relate it as so understood by our Lord Himself. But the subject was one on which they were well entitled to ask Him to give a ruling, the matter being one in debate between Jewish teachers at the time, and as to which one who was honoured as a rabbi was properly consulted. In practice, no doubt, the tribute had to be paid; but could it be theoretically justified for men who were proud to be still living under a theocracy? I can remember how, when I was a boy, theory and practice were reconciled on a similar question. It was against the Quaker conscience to pay Church rates; and these it was the duty of the churchwardens to collect. They used to go into the Quakers' shops, and when the owner pleaded a conscientious objection to paying, they used to go to the tills and take out the right sum; and, on the Quaker principle of non-resistance, the robbery was quietly submitted to.

The question put by the rulers had failed of effect because our Lord's answer was capable of a double interpretation. He clearly claimed to exercise authority such as that to which the Baptist had been entitled; and this answer was the more forcible if I am right in thinking that the claim of Jesus to be John's successor was more generally recognised than modern readers admit. But about John there was a double opinion: in popular belief he was undoubtedly a prophet, entitled to speak with divine authority; in the opinion of Herod's partisans, who no doubt had sympathisers in Jerusalem, he was one who had been justly put to death for seditious utterances against

constituted authority. The question about tribute money was one most skilfully devised to bring about a crisis, having the most innocent aspect, yet with deep political tendencies.

We need not be surprised if the Pharisees and the Herodians, though at opposite poles of theological opinion, were united by their common hostility to Jesus, whose influence with the multitude both felt to be dangerous. Though St Luke does not mention the co-operation of Herod's party in the present attempt to ensnare our Lord, yet the whole of St Mark's narrative shows that during the last year of the life of Jesus He had not felt Himself safe in Herod's jurisdiction. He could no longer make Capernaum His headquarters; and wherever He went He tried to conceal His presence, and discouraged the publication of His miraculous acts. It could not have been acceptable news at Herod's court that John's work was being still actively carried on.

In our Lord's reply to this attempt to ensnare Him, the general question of submission to a foreign yoke, which had not been formally raised, was put aside, and the question of paying taxes was treated as a case of the general principle that every one is entitled to get his own. Modern casuists have raised doubts whether this principle was applicable to the present case; but this point must be determined by the general feeling of men at the time, and not by our modern rules. We ourselves might hold that the denarius was the property of the man who held it, no doubt in return for value given; and not the property of the state which coined it. Yet no one denies the right of the state to make a profit on its coinage. Our own state makes a large profit on its silver coinage, the intrinsic value of these coins being much below the nominal value. The result, then, of our Lord's answer was that instead of His forfeiting the allegiance of His followers, they were filled with admiration of Him. They all understood the treachery of the question, and the difficulty of answering it with-

out offence, and they greatly admired their Master's tact. It is evident that the answer which the questioners expected and hoped to elicit was one which would bring Him into collision with the Roman Government. This is plain from their flattering address: "If you evade our question it can only be that you are afraid to speak your mind openly. If you fear the face of man no more than the Baptist did, do not shrink from telling us openly if we are wrong in paying tribute."

Mark xii. 14, ἐπ' ἀληθείας.—St Matthew understands the clause as describing the manner in which Jesus taught the way of God, but removes all ambiguity by a transposition, τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις. The R.V. of Mark reduces the saying to, *Of a truth thou teachest the way of God*. If the passage stood alone, it might well be maintained that this was the correct translation of St Mark's Greek words; but I cannot reject the commentary given by St Matthew, who was more likely than any modern to know what meaning St Mark wished to convey.

In place of εἰδὼς τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, St Luke has κατανοήσας τὴν πανουργίαν, which does not exceed the freedom with which St Luke habitually uses his authorities; but St Matthew in this section varies from Mark to a greater degree than is common with him, so as to suggest that he is also using another authority. He has here γνοὺς τὴν πονηρίαν, yet he shows his acquaintance with Mark by immediately introducing the word ὑποκριταί in our Lord's reply to His interrogators.

THE SADDUCEES' QUESTION

MARK xii. 18-23.

MATT. xxii. 23-28.

LUKE xx. 27-33.

It having been agreed by our Lord's adversaries in consultation that the best way of putting a stop to His teaching was to elicit from Him some utterance on which a charge damaging to His reputation could be founded, the question concerning the tribute money was devised; and none could be better suited to its intended purpose. But the Sadducean members of the Council could not decently pretend that they had any scruples on the subject. The Sadducees were much looser than the Pharisees in their interpretation of the Mosaic Law; and having as rulers enforced the obligation of paying tribute, they could scarcely submit the propriety of their action to the judgment of a popular leader. And if I rightly understand St Mark's imperfect tense ἐπιρώτων, we have no reason to think that the Sadducees came to Him in a body or by their representatives, but rather that individual Sadducees successively tried to perplex Him with what no doubt was one of their stock difficulties on the subject of the Resurrection.

The language of St Matthew here shows more difference from Mark than is customary with him, not only by the introduction of a different word, such as ἐπιγαμβρεύσει, but in the structure of many of the sentences. I am therefore confirmed in my opinion that, in this section at least, St Matthew used a Greek translation different from St Mark's. And it is worth remarking that one awkwardness of expression in which St Luke blindly follows Mark is avoided by St Matthew. St Mark recites the law of Moses in the form, *If a man's brother die, and leave a wife behind him, and leave no child, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.* Of course the brother who is to marry her is the man himself; and St Matthew makes

a necessary correction in writing *If a man die*. There is one point in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark, namely, that in *last of all the woman also died*, they have ὑστερον instead of Mark's ἔσχατον; and ὑστερον is not a Lucan word. If any stress is to be laid on this, it would follow that St Luke also knew the same Greek translation as that used by St Matthew, though he uses Mark so much as to make me doubtful whether he had any other Greek authority. On the other hand, St Luke follows Mark's Μωσῆς ἔγραψεν instead of Matthew's Μωσῆς εἶπεν. Again, Matthew's προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν would lead one to think that they said so on this occasion; and therefore he changed for the worse if he knew Mark's οἵτινες λέγουσιν. Both the other Evangelists saw the need of somewhat abridging Mark's account of the successive deaths of the brothers.

OUR LORD'S ANSWER

MARK xii. 24-27.

MATT. xxii. 29-33.

LUKE xx. 34-40.

It is plain from what has been said that our Lord's adversaries would have been ill advised if they had as a body made themselves responsible for the question which some individuals among them rashly put to Him. For the subject was one on which they were themselves divided; and our Lord's answer received sympathy and approval from the Pharisaic members of the Council.

The present question could not well have been raised as to the case of a man having two wives; for polygamy not having been then expressly forbidden, it might be ruled that in the resurrection he should keep them both. That a woman should have two husbands, even consecutively, was then counted so discreditable that it was felt to be necessary to produce a case where such an arrangement was contemplated by the Mosaic Law. But the Sadducees spoiled their

case by over-elaboration. As they put it, it would be natural to decide that she should be the wife of the first husband. If we believed in resurrection wives, and had no inspired guidance, we should be puzzled to decide whom a twice married woman could claim as her husband in the resurrection life. I think that we should have to say that she ought to be given her choice; for much might depend on the length of time she had lived with each. She might decide in favour of the husband of her youth, if his successor had not had time to supplant him in her affections. But after a certain time, if the latter had been good to her, he would be fresher in her memory. And cases have occurred when the second husband would have been her original choice, if the pressure of friends or prudential reasons had not compelled her to take another. The knot of all these difficulties has been cut by our Lord's ruling that in the resurrection life there shall be no marrying; and the acceptance of this ruling is made all the easier by St Paul's remark that there is no ground for assuming that the resurrection body may not differ as much from that of this life, as a stalk of wheat differs from the little grain out of which it has sprung.

St Luke seems not to have in view the general resurrection; the resurrection of which he speaks being taken as a privilege of which only the just are deemed worthy. This seems to agree with Revelation xx. 5, 6.

St Luke does not give in this place the question concerning the Great Commandment, of which he had made use already (x. 25). St Luke, however, shows his obligation to Mark by placing at the end of this Sadducean question the note which Mark has at the end of the question which Luke omits, οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

THE GREAT COMMANDMENT

MARK xii. 28-34.

Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, εἰδὼς ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, Ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι, Πρώτη ἐστίν, Ἄκουε, Ἰσραὴλ, Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστίν, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου. δευτέρα αὕτη, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν. Ἐῖπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεὺς, Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι εἰς ἐστὶν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσώτερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ὅτι νουνεχῶς ἀπεκρίθη εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Οὐ μακρὰν [εἶ] ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. Καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκετι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

MATT. xxii. 34-40.

Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἐφίμωσεν τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν εἰς ἐξ αὐτῶν νομικὸς πειράζων αὐτόν, Διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ, Ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλη καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου· αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή. δευτέρα ὁμοία αὕτη, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται.

In this section we have so much difference between St Matthew's account and St Mark's as to make it probable that St Matthew had obtained information also from another authority. According to St Mark, the questioner is not actuated by any malignant motive in his enquiry; and he heartily approves of our Lord's answer. According to St Matthew, the questioner was an emissary of the Pharisees, who, having heard of the failure of the Sadducees, hoped to be more successful if they made trial themselves. St Mark's account seems to be more probable; and if it were not for St Matthew's preamble we could even accept his *πειράζων αὐτόν* as not inconsistent with it, if we understand the verb as only meaning *proving* or *making trial of* Him, viz., by testing His ability to deal with a question disputed among the doctors

of the law. No political use could be made of His answer, whatever it might have been; and by the answers to the previous questions they had already got materials enough on which to found an indictment before the Roman Governor.

Luke has not the story of the "Great Commandment"; but the reason may be that he has already told one in such affinity with it, that he does not choose to tell both, and the earlier may well be considered here.

LUKE x. 25-29.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ νομικός τις ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτὸν λέγων, Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ, Ὁρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης· τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ ζήσῃ. Ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιοῦσαι ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον;

This story has an affinity with the story we are now considering, and also a still closer one with the story of the rich young man, who puts the same question to our Lord as that which the "lawyer" puts here. And it may be asked why the Evangelist should twice tell of this question without mentioning on the second occasion that it had been asked before. I have already said that a doublet often arises when a writer uses two different authorities. St Luke probably obtained these two anecdotes from independent sources; and the beginning of this one with *καὶ ἰδοὺ* suggests, though it does not prove, that the source was Aramaic. This story and that of the rich young man are like each other, in that both contain a recital of the Commandments; and I have already noted as a peculiarity of Matthew, which I count as a mark of later date, that it sums up the second table of the Decalogue in the precept *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*; a summary which was not natural to a Jew, and which St Luke informs us was made by our Lord on a different occasion.

It is to be noted that the command *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself* is not one of the "Ten Words"; and is not found when these are recorded in Exodus or Deuteronomy; but as a separate command, Lev. xix. 18. To a modern reader the questioner's demand when, willing to justify himself, he asked *Who is my neighbour?* sounds captious or irrelevant. Yet this very question is one that we are bound to ask. Whom did the Mosaic legislator mean, when he directed each of his people to love his neighbour? I think that if we read the verse in Leviticus in connexion with its context, we must consider that the legislator was not there extending his view beyond the house of Israel: *Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.* The precepts against usury, Exod. xxii. 25, Lev. xxv. 36, are given their justification in the brotherly relation between descendants of the same patriarch; and in Deut. xxiii. 19 it is expressly laid down that a Jew may take interest from a stranger, though not from his brethren. Yet we should not be justified in putting this limitation uniformly on the word *neighbour* wherever it occurs in commands, as, for instance, in deducing from the command *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour* the conclusion that we may bear false witness against a foreigner. A Jew, then, would not regard the second table of the Decalogue as expressing his duty *to his neighbour*. It was therefore a most natural question to put concerning the command *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, Does it mean that we must love a foreigner as ourself? and our Lord's answer in the parable recorded only by St Luke practically means, Yes, even though the foreigner be a Samaritan, the kind of foreigner regarded with most rancorous hatred by the Jews.

It may be asked, Why did St Luke repeat an account of a question so like one which he had recorded before? and I believe the answer to be on account of the different use to be made of the two stories. If St

Matthew seems to aim at throwing into a connected discourse sayings of our Lord which had been separately known as part of our Saviour's teaching, St Luke seems to have set himself to learn concerning each saying the occasion on which it was delivered. Thus concerning the parable recorded by St Matthew in connexion with the Two Sons and the Wicked Husbandmen, *i.e.*, that of the Great Supper, St Luke tells us that it was elicited by the exclamation of a guest at a supper at which Jesus was present, *Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God* (xiv. 15). Now the story of the question put by the rich young man leads on to our Lord's exclamation, *How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!* On the other hand, the question of the *νομικός* leads up to the question, *Who is my neighbour?* and the parable of the Good Samaritan. It was impossible to combine these two continuations into one story; and so St Luke, who did not choose to leave out either, had to tell them separately.

OUR LORD'S OWN QUESTION

MARK xii. 35-37.

MATT. xxii. 41-46.

LUKE xx. 41-44.

The first sight interpretation of this incident is that Jesus, having answered to the complete satisfaction of His hearers the question with which His adversaries had hoped to perplex Him, now, when they were silenced and did not venture to put any more questions to Him, turns the tables on them and asks them in turn to give Him a solution of a Scripture difficulty. Yet, notwithstanding the ἀποκριθεῖς, the imperfect ἔλεγεν makes it doubtful whether this question formed part of the same discourse. It would seem from St Mark's account that our Lord's avowed enemies had retired, and that He then resumed His work of teaching. The lawyer who put the question about the Great Command-

ment appears not so much an enemy as a candid enquirer. Therefore I think we ought not to assume that this question was put chiefly with the object of putting His adversaries to shame. It appears that His object went far beyond that of defeating them in the trial of wits to which they had challenged Him. He puts His own claims on a higher level than they had imagined. They had thought that those who gave Him the title *Son of David* ascribed to Him a dignity so far beyond His rights that He ought in modesty to have disclaimed it. He now brings out strongly that if He were the Messiah, this title does not adequately express His dignity. If He were no more than the Son of David, He were David's inferior. But the Psalmist represents the Messiah as David's superior. And, in fact, if He was Son of David, He was in a higher sense Son of God.

It seems now to have come to open war between the Jewish council and the new prophet. They drop the affectation of respect by which they had hoped to elicit incriminating expressions from Him, and had fully made up their mind to destroy Him, as Jesus well knew. On the other hand, He had gained so much favour with the multitude that He would not be refused a hearing if He spoke His mind freely about the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees. Accordingly St Matthew puts in this place (chap. xxiii.) a long invective against the ruling body. Very possibly St Matthew has brought together here sayings of like purport spoken on different occasions; but at the time we are now considering things had come to such a crisis, that the invective recorded by St Matthew is altogether suitable to the place which he assigns it. It does not reappear here in Luke (see Luke xi. 39-52), who shows his dependence on Mark by giving in this place parallels to what St Mark has given, and to none of the sayings preserved by St Matthew alone.

THE HYPOCRISY OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES

MARK xii. 38-40.

Καὶ ἐν τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν, Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἄσπασμους ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δαίπνοις, οἱ κατέσθοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι· οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσώτερον κρίμα.

LUKE xx. 45-47.

Ἀκούοντας δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς, Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς καὶ φιλοῦντων ἄσπασμους ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δαίπνοις, οἱ κατέσθουσιν τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσεύχονται· οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσώτερον κρίμα.

MATT. xxiii. 6, 7.

Φιλοῦσι δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δαίπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄσπασμους ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων Ῥαββεῖ.

LUKE xi. 43.

Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄσπασμους ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς.

This passage of Mark is closely connected with the section last considered, concerning the relations of the Messiah to David. That section begins *ἔλεγεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*. The present is clearly a continuation, beginning as it does *καὶ ἐν τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν*; from which we may conclude that both sections report parts of our Lord's teaching on the same occasion.

I do not hesitate to decide that St Mark is here the abridger, and not St Matthew the expander. In fact St Mark's omission of the greater part of the discourse is no proof of his unacquaintance with it; since it is St Mark's custom to omit long discourses. The doublet in St Luke's eleventh chapter may indicate that St Luke found the verse which he cites also in a source different from Mark, though we certainly must admit the possibility that our Lord used the same striking words on more occasions than one.

St Luke in copying Mark makes a couple of verbal alterations. Instead of βλέπετε, he has προσέχετε; and he corrects the grammatical awkwardness of Mark, whose ἀσπασμούς has no verb to govern it, by supplying φιλούτων. Still I must notice as an indication of the use of a common document by St Matthew and St Luke, that St Luke tells that the warning against the scribes was addressed by our Lord *to his disciples* in the hearing of the multitude. St Mark has made no mention of the disciples. But they appear in the opening of Matt. xxiii., *[Then spake Jesus to the multitudes and to his disciples.]*

THE WIDOW'S MITE

MARK xii. 41-44.

LUKE xxi. 1-4.

St Luke's account is a mere compression of St Mark's, with a few stylistic improvements. The Hebrew word Ἀμὴν is translated ἀληθῶς; instead of μία χήρα, he has τινὰ χήραν. Our Lord and His disciples saw the poor people casting their coppers into the treasury; for the smallest donations were accepted. It was possible to see this woman's gift—two of the smallest coins. I dare say it is too fanciful of me to infer from πτωχή that the woman was a beggar, and that the λεπτόν limited the generosity of one or two of her benefactors. Unfortunately St Luke gives no countenance to this idea; for in place of πτωχή he has πενιχράν.

THE PAROUSIA DISCOURSE

MARK xiii. 1, 2.

Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐ-
τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λέγει
αὐτῷ εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν
αὐτοῦ, Διδάσκαλε, ἶδε πο-
ταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ
οικοδομαί. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Βλέπεις ταύ-
τας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδο-
μάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε
λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ
καταλυθῇ.

MATT. xxiv. 1, 2.

Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπορεύετο,
καὶ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ
αὐτοῦ ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτῷ τὰς
οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ· ὁ δὲ
ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,
Οὐ βλέπετε ταῦτα πάντα;
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ
ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον
ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

LUKE xxi. 5, 6.

Καὶ τινων λεγόντων
περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ὅτι λίθοις
καλοῖς καὶ ἀναθήμασιν
κεκόσμηται, εἶπεν, Ταῦτα
ἃ θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύσονται
ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθή-
σεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὧδε
ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

St Mark's account is closely connected with what has preceded. Our Lord, having finished His discourse, is leaving the Temple, when one of the disciples who accompanied Him, himself no doubt a Galilean to whom this great piece of architecture was not too familiar, being struck with admiration at the size of the stones and the magnificence of the buildings, calls our Lord's attention to them; and receives in reply the startling prediction of the approaching ruin of all that they are now so proud of. Nothing more passes on the instant; but soon afterwards, when our Lord has seated Himself on the opposite hill, other disciples to whom this terrible prediction had been communicated gather round their Master and ask for further explanations. The story loses much of its sharpness in St Matthew's version. He represents the disciples as coming to our Lord *to shew Him* the buildings of the Temple; and what was quite natural when reported as the remark of a single disciple on the structures by which they passed, loses much of its credibility when represented as a common attempt of the disciples to *shew Him* the Temple in which He had been teaching. And had He never visited it before? St Luke here too is very vague. He tells the story as if it merely was that our Lord was present when they were speaking about the Temple. This might as well have happened in Galilee. But St Luke shews his knowledge of the particular occasion

of this prophecy of doom; for he goes on, ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε.

MARK xiii. 3, 4.

Καὶ καθημένον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Εἰπὸν ἡμῖν πότε ταῦτα ἔσται, καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα πάντα.

MATT. xxiv. 3.

Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν Ἐλαιῶν προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ κατ' ἰδίαν λέγοντες, Εἰπὸν ἡμῖν πότε ταῦτα ἔσται, καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.

LUKE xxi. 7.

Ἐπηρώτησάν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Διδάσκαλε, πότε οὖν ταῦτα ἔσται, καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι;

St Mark here gives the information that the discourse here recorded was addressed only to four of the chief disciples, viz., the four whose call is related in St Mark's first chapter. This is the explanation of the κατ' ἰδίαν which St Matthew has copied from Mark. It is easy to understand that a prediction concerning the end of the Roman dominion could not be safely addressed to the multitude; but it was not even addressed to all the Twelve. St Mark and St Luke, who follows him, represent these disciples as only enquiring when the things should take place of which our Lord had already spoken, viz., the destruction of the Temple. St Matthew makes them also enquire concerning *the sign of our Lord's parousia*—a word peculiar, in the Gospels, to Matthew—and of the end of the dispensation. I count this addition by St Matthew as an indication of the posteriority of his Gospel, as we have it. Our Lord had spoken about the destruction of the Temple; and it was natural that His hearers should ask when and how that was to take place; but He had said nothing about His going away, or about the end of the world. At the time this question was put, the disciples had not grasped the idea that their Master was to leave them; and therefore it was not likely that they should ask about His coming again.

All the Evangelists tell us that the disciples asked about *the sign* of the fulfilment of His predictions—a question to which none of them reports a direct answer.

But the general drift of our Lord's teaching is that no sign was necessary ; the coming was to be quite sudden ; and, when it did take place, it was not to be local, but like the lightning which cometh out of the East and shineth even to the West. In short, our Lord's answer does not tell the sign, but rather warns the disciples against being misled by accepting as signs what were not so.

The conclusion to which my own judgment inclines is that the discourse beginning with Mark xiii. 5 belongs to the older record, but that the account of the circumstances in which it was spoken is St Mark's, probably derived by him from St Peter ; and that this little introduction was copied from Mark by the other Evangelists.

THE FIRST STAGE

MARK xiii. 5-8.

Ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς, Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες ὅτι, Ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσῃτε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων, μὴ θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος. ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται λιμοὶ ἀρχὴ ὧδίων ταῦτα.

MATT. xxiv. 4-8.

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ χριστός, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν. μετὰ τὴν λήσιν δὲ ἀκούειν πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων· ὁρᾶτε, μὴ θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γὰρ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐπω ἔστιν τὸ τέλος. ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους· πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὧδίων.

LUKE xxi. 8-11.

Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Βλέπετε μὴ πλανηθῇτε· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες, Ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν· μὴ πορευθῇτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσῃτε πολέμους καὶ ἀκαταστασίας, μὴ πτοηθῇτε· δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι πρῶτον, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος. Τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐγερθήσεται ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ ἔσονται, φόβηθρά τε καὶ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἔσται.

We cannot but be struck by the close relationship between Matthew and Mark ; probably because both copy a common document. St Luke as usual employs his own phraseology, and does so even to a greater degree in the remainder of this discourse. In the persecutions which speedily followed, as predicted here, Christians must have been constantly consoled

and strengthened by hearing the prediction which our Lord had made of what they were enduring, and His directions for their behaviour under it. None of our Lord's discourses therefore was more likely to be recited or referred to in the Christian assemblies, or to receive on repetition small additions or variations; and St Luke's changes from St Mark's version need not be assumed to have been arbitrarily made by himself, but may faithfully represent the form current in the weekly service of his time.

I have already noticed St Mark's use of ἤρξατο with an infinitive on the first occasion when a continuous action is mentioned, and which is replaced by an imperfect in the further relation. Here I think St Mark would have used the aorist, if he meant to report verbally our Lord's answer to a definite question. The actual form of expression conveys that he is giving the substance of more conversations than one.

THE SECOND STAGE

MARK xiii. 9, 10.

Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς· παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

MATT. x. 17, 18.

Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

LUKE xxi. 12, 13.

Πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ διώξουσιν, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακάς, ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου· ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον.

MATT. xxiv. 9-14.

Τότε παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλίψιν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσιν καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους· καὶ πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐγερθήσονται καὶ πλανήσουσιν πολλοὺς· καὶ διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται. καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τότε ἔξει τὸ τέλος.

I have put by the side of the extract from Mark, one from Matthew x., which is in this place a closer parallel to St Mark's report than that in Matt. xxiv. Owing to the dislocation of order in the several authorities it is not easy always to put the corresponding verses side by side. But, as I have already intimated, the Christian Church soon after our Lord's departure had to suffer persecutions as trying as those which beset them near the destruction of Jerusalem; and the disciples must have been eagerly looking out for the hoped for deliverance through our Lord's predicted return. In these circumstances the Christian teachers must have made great use of these prophetic announcements of their Master, and it is not wonderful if unusual difficulty was found by those who attempted to reduce to an orderly narrative the notes which had been taken of their reports, and if there should be omissions and transpositions when the works of different Evangelists were compared.

εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. — No doubt there is some truth in the explanation of those commentators who understand these words as referring to the fact that by the testimony borne before rulers the claims of Jesus would be made known to many who would not otherwise have heard of them. But I cannot help thinking that something more is meant, namely, that the proclamation of the Gospel would throw on their own heads the blood of those that rejected it, and clear of guilt those who had faithfully announced it. This comes out more clearly in the turn that St Luke gives to this passage, ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον which represents the *Liberavi animam meam* so often quoted from Ezekiel (iii. 19; xxxiii. 9, etc.) by disregarded prophets. The stress is laid by St Luke on the gain to the preachers themselves from faithful utterances. I think we have an indication of later date in Matthew, in his addition καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. The earliest persecutions of the Jewish Christians were inflicted by their own countrymen. St Matthew's Gospel seems

to have been written at a time when τὰ ἔθνη were more to be dreaded.

MARK xiii. 11-13.

Καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε, ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦτο λαλεῖτε, οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. καὶ παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, ὃ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.

MATT. x. 19-22.

Ὅταν δὲ παραδῶσιν ὑμᾶς, μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε· δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσητε· οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν. παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς. καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου· ὃ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.

LUKE xii. 11, 12.

Ὅταν δὲ εἰσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς [ἢ τί] ἀπολογήσῃθε ἢ τί εἴπητε· τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν.

LUKE xxi. 14-19.

Θέτε οὖν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν μὴ προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι, ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν ᾗ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι ἢ ἀντειπεῖν ἅπαντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν. παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. καὶ θρῖξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται. ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

We see on inspection of the parallel passages that the true parallel to the discourse of Mark xiii. is to be found rather in Matt. x. than in Matt. xxiv. In fact I believe that St Mark borrows from the original of Matthew, and that in Matt. xxiv. the editor of St Matthew's Gospel has made use of Mark; a phenomenon to which we find parallels in other cases.

Assuming, as we have a right to do, that what we have here in the form of a prediction was actually realised in fact, we have in this passage a lively description of the condition of Jewish Christians in the early days of the Church. Our first idea might be that there was little to separate them from their unconverted brethren. Both no doubt expected a Messiah to deliver the nation; but the gulf was wide between those who believed that He had come

already and those who were still waiting for Him ; as wide as between those who buried their dead in the sure and certain hope of a resurrection, and those who maintained that the resurrection was past already. We need not hesitate to accept the early tradition that James, the first head of the Jerusalem Church, was highly respected by non-Christian Jews as a man of exemplary piety. And yet we may believe it to be perfectly true that the members of the Church were *hated of all men* ; in other words, that they belonged to an extremely unpopular sect. Religious dissensions can be most bitter between men who are in substantial agreement on all points which an outsider would regard as fundamental. At the present day a non-Christian might pronounce that there was no fundamental difference between one Christian sect and another ; yet we know how bitter theological animosities have been ; such as have been able to break all the ties of natural affection.

In this section, St Luke seems to have followed Mark. But that all three Gospels drew from a common source is an hypothesis well supported by their many agreements. Several warnings which St Matthew describes as given on the first calling of the Apostles are placed by St Luke in a somewhat advanced period of His Galilean ministry, while St Mark reports them as uttered but a few days before His death. We might count it a real variation between the Evangelists if they differed as to the time when any particular event occurred ; but the case is different when we are dealing with the time at which a particular saying was uttered ; since probability is altogether against the supposition that He only said it once ; nay, it is the things which He repeated most often which were most likely to have been imprinted on the memory of His hearers, and to have been incorporated by the Evangelists in their narratives.

The directions not to premeditate a defence are the same in Matthew and Mark ; but I think that

Matthew's phrase, *the Spirit of your Father*, is likely to be more ancient than Mark's and Luke's *Holy Spirit*. The former phrase might merely mean an influence, the latter designates a Person. If a man could be possessed by an unclean spirit, still more might he be possessed by a holy spirit. The Church did not speak of *a* holy spirit, but of *the* Holy Spirit.

In the direction against premeditation there is a doublet in St Luke's Gospel, xii. 11; xxi. 14. I think that the explanation of this doublet is that the passage in Luke xii., several of the verses in which context have no close connexion with each other, is taken from a previous source containing sayings of our Lord, the same having also been used by St Mark; and that in Luke xxi. the Evangelist is copying Mark, but that he compresses his account by omitting some phrases which he has inserted already, whereby he gains room for some additions from another source.

If the words $\pi\omega\varsigma\ \eta\ \tau\acute{\iota}$ in Luke xii. 11 are genuine, the coincidence with Matt x. 19 is surely more than accidental, and we have clear proof that St Matthew and St Luke are drawing from the same source. And though Westcott and Hort give in their margin the alternative of omitting $\eta\ \tau\acute{\iota}$, yet the authority for omission is altogether Western; and no doubt Westcott and Hort consider this as one of what they call Western non-interpolations. Yet when our discussion of the Synoptic problem leads us to believe that in other places St Mark, who omits them, has been drawing from a source common to Matthew and Luke, the probability strongly is that St Luke is following the same source here; and if there has been assimilation of one Gospel to another it is more likely that the Western copyist has rather been guilty of assimilating Luke to Mark than the Eastern of assimilating Luke to Matthew.

Proceeding now to what follows in Mark we have

here first what may be called a direct answer to the question put to our Lord, which expressly only referred to the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple. I count it the most probable account of the composition of this chapter that the Evangelist was indebted to a previous source for the matter contained in verses 5-13 inclusive; but that that previous source had only contained general warnings of coming persecution, and that St Mark was indebted to St Peter for his knowledge that there had been a special discourse in answer to the question concerning the Temple put by four Apostles. Consequently I commence the investigation with the expectation that I shall find the other two Synoptics dependent on Mark alone for this section; but I am prepared to abandon this preconception if facts do not bear it out.

MARK xiii. 14-16.

"Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέ-
λυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως
ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ
ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω, τότε
οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέ-
τωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, ὁ ἐπὶ
τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω
μηδὲ εἰσελθᾶτω τι ἅραι
ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ
εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρε-
ψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἅραι
τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

MATT. xxiv. 15-18.

"Ὅταν οὖν ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέ-
λυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ
ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προ-
φήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ,
ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω,
τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευ-
γέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, ὁ ἐπὶ
τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω
ἅραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐ-
τοῦ, καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ
ἐπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσω ἅραι
τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

LUKE xxi. 20-22.

"Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε κυκλο-
μένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων
Ἱερουσαλήμ, τότε γνώτε
ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις
αὐτῆς. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰου-
δαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ
ὄρη, καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς
ἐκχωρεῖτωσαν, καὶ οἱ ἐν
ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσ-
θωσαν εἰς αὐτήν, ὅτι ἡμέ-
ραι ἐκδικήσεως αὐταῖ εἰσιν
τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα τὰ
γεγραμμένα.

Here the identity between Matthew and Mark is striking. That Mark is the elder may be interred from *Let him that readeth understand*. This does not mean, as some English readers imagine, "Let him that readeth this Gospel understand;" for we could not suppose that our Lord in speaking would introduce the case of one reading His words after they had been committed to writing. What I take to be meant is the case of one reading the Old Testament. In other words, the phrase *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως* is the catchword by which the reader will recognise the prophetic passage, the fulfilment of which is announced. St Matthew has clinched the reference, by putting in *which was spoken of*

by *Daniel the prophet*; but in that case there would not have been the necessity for calling the attention of the reader; therefore I regard Mark as here the original.

Mark has *standing where he ought not*; Matthew *standing in the holy place*. Some have supposed *the holy place* to be the Temple. If so, the sentence could not mean the planting of a standard there; for it would be then too late to flee. Possibly there is a reference to some previous defilement of the Temple by Roman authorities. Luke says *When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies*; but surely if the disciples waited for that encompassing, it would be too late for them to flee. I think we must regard St Luke as but giving a commentary on words which St Mark has preserved in their original form, and which would be satisfied by the entry of the Roman army into Palestine. St Luke's account may have been modified by what he had heard of what actually occurred. Yet I take it that Jerusalem is the scene and that ἐν ταῖς χώραις (Luke xxi. 21) is to be understood of fields in the neighbourhood of the doomed city, into which the inhabitants were warned not to return.

Here again we have a doublet in Luke xvii. 31 :

Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὃς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μὴ καταβάτω ἄραι αὐτά, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἁγρῷ ὁμοίως μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.

This doublet removes all doubt of there having been a section in the original source dealing with the destruction of Jerusalem.

What I take to be peculiar to St Mark is his defining the discourse as spoken at the request of disciples, in sight of the Temple, on the last visit of Jesus to Jerusalem. St Mark, I doubt not, has faithfully preserved for us prophetic utterances which were remembered as having been delivered by his Master, but the form of St Mark's account does not oblige us to believe that all were delivered in a single discourse; and the manner in which St Luke uses one fragment in chapter xii. and another in chapter xvii. leads me to think that he took them, not from the report of a single

discourse delivered shortly before our Lord's Passion, but rather from a document containing sayings of our Lord collected without definite notes of the time when each was spoken.

MARK xiii. 17-20.

Οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ
ἐχοῦσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλα-
ζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς
ἡμέραις. προσεύχεσθε δὲ
ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος·
ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι
ἐκείναι θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέ-
γονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς
ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ οὐ μὴ γένη-
ται. καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν
Κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν
ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ. ἀλλὰ
διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὗς ἐξ-
ελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς
ἡμέρας.

MATT. xxiv. 19-22.

Οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ
ἐχοῦσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλα-
ζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς
ἡμέραις. προσεύχεσθε δὲ
ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ
ὑμῶν χειμῶνος μηδὲ σαβ-
βάτω· ἔσται γὰρ τότε
θλίψις μεγάλη οἷα οὐ γέ-
γονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου
ἕως τοῦ νῦν οὐδ' οὐ μὴ
γένηται. καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολο-
βώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖ-
ναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα
σάρξ. διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκ-
τοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ
ἡμέραι ἐκείναι.

LUKE xxi. 23.

Οὐαὶ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ
ἐχοῦσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλα-
ζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς
ἡμέραις· ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη
μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ
ὀργὴ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ.

The woe at the beginning is in identical words in Matthew and Mark. The passage in Luke is only an abridgment of what St Mark says concerning the coming tribulation. But in the next verse there is a significant difference between Matthew and Mark. St Mark represents the disciples as directed to pray that their flight should not be in the winter, but St Matthew adds *neither on a Sabbath*. The most natural explanation is that St Matthew here gives us the original form in which our Lord's instructions were reported by the Apostles; but that St Mark omitted the mention of the Sabbath, as having no significance for his Gentile hearers or readers. Some remarks are obvious, viz., that, in accordance with what has been said before, the flight is contemplated as on the occurrence of some sudden or startling warning, on which the disciples were to start in flight at once, without even waiting to collect any clothes they had not at the time on their persons. It is evident that it is a flight from Jerusalem *to the mountains* that is contemplated; and so we can understand why the warnings of the necessity for instant flight are not recorded by St Luke. The calamities

predicted in his report of our Lord's words are such as could not be escaped by flight. It is evident too that at the time when St Matthew's Gospel was written no change in the day of the Sabbath had been made by the Apostles.

Although I understand all this prophecy to refer to the siege of Jerusalem, I consider that the date of the Gospel which records it must have been earlier than the end of the troubles. The traditional story is very credible that, in consequence of our Lord's warnings, there took place a flight of Christians from the besieged city to Pella, when the Romans, who had planted their standards in the *Holy Place*, retired for a time. For it is quite credible that before the fall of Jerusalem our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of the city, and His exhortation to flight had become current among Christians. That our Lord had given such warnings we have every reason to believe.

MARK xiii. 21-23.

Καὶ τότε εἰάν τις ὑμῶν εἴπῃ, 'Ἴδε ὦδε ὁ χριστός' Ἴδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε· ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν εἰ δυνατόν τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε· προεῖρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα.

MATT. xxiv. 23-25.

Τότε εἰάν τις ὑμῶν εἴπῃ, 'Ἰδοὺ ὦδε ὁ χριστός' ἢ 'Ὡδε, μὴ πιστεύσητε' ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὥστε πλανᾶσθαι εἰ δυνατόν καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς· ἰδοὺ προεῖρηκα ὑμῖν.

MATT. xxiv. 26-28.

'Εὰν οὖν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν, 'Ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστίν, μὴ ἐξέλθητε'· Ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, μὴ πιστεύσητε· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν, οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· ὅπου ἐὰν ᾖ τὸ πῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ αἰετοί.

LUKE xvii. 23, 24, 37.

Καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν, 'Ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ἢ' Ἰδοὺ ὦδε' μὴ [ἀπέλθῃτε μὴδὲ] διώξητε. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. . . . καὶ ἀποκριθέντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ποῦ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ αἰετοὶ ἐπισυναχθήσονται.

My idea about this passage is that St Matthew has first copied Mark and then given a translation of the original which St Mark has abridged. Thus, where what I take to be the original had *Behold, he is in the wilderness*; . . . *behold, he is in the inner chambers*. St Mark has, *Lo, here is the Christ*; or, *Lo there*. In St Matthew's version the idea is better brought out. There will be no need to go to look for Him; when

He comes, there will be no possibility of mistake about it. His appearance will be like that of a flash of lightning, as sudden and as universal; making itself perceptible everywhere. It matters not where the carcass falls, there the vultures at once congregate. It has often been remarked with what rapidity these long-sighted birds discover where prey is to be found, and quickly assemble in numbers, where not one had been seen a very short time before.

St Luke's account, though so full of coincidences with Matthew and Mark that the existence of a common element cannot be disputed, yet gives me the impression, not that St Luke used St Mark's Gospel, but that he derived his information from another ear-witness, or at least that he combined such a report with St Mark's. The whole section, Luke xvii. 20-37, does not read like a patch work; but has such continuous unity that I do not see how to break it up into fragments.

MARK xiii. 24-27.

Ἐν ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην ὃ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τό φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης· καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς [αὐτοῦ] ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.

MATT. xxiv. 29-31.

Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὃ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τό φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σῆμεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς· καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ' ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως [τῶν] ἄκρων αὐτῶν.

LUKE xxi. 25-28.

Καὶ ἔσονται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἀστροῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἡχοῦς θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου, ἀποψυχόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, αἱ γὰρ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς. Ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γινεσθαι ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν, διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.

In the first of these verses from Mark we have the sign of the approaching tribulation. It is to be noted here that St Mark does not use his favourite *εὐθέως*, but that St Matthew does. I infer that St Matthew is

here not copying Mark, but in all probability drawing from an older document. I do not suppose that any of our existing Gospels was written before the year A.D. 70; and any one who wrote later must have known that the great tribulation preceding the siege of Jerusalem was not *immediately* followed by our Lord's second coming. If St Matthew did not add the *εὐθέως* on his own authority, the document which contained it is likely to have preceded the siege; which seems to me not only possible but probable; for I do not think we should have had so full a record of our Lord's utterances if they had not been put into writing while some of His hearers were still alive.

Instead of St Matthew's *the stars shall fall from heaven* (πεσούνται), St Mark has *ἔσονται πίπτοντες*, which to me suggests, not a sudden catastrophe in which all the stars should fall, but a constant series of those meteoric appearances which, even among ourselves, are commonly called falling stars. The whole context is a description of what should happen after the tribulation, and before our Lord's second coming. I take it to indicate a season of great atmospheric disturbances, many meteoric exhibitions and much storm, the sea and the waves roaring. Whether such conditions prevailed in the latter years of the first century, historians have thought it beneath their dignity to tell; but it seems to me very credible that they did, and that Christians were naturally led to think that now at length the predicted reappearance of our Lord was immediately to be expected.

THE FIG TREE PARABLE

MARK xiii. 28, 29.

Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ᾗδῃ ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς ἀπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύῃ τὰ φύλλα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν. οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδῃτε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις.

MATT. xxiv. 32, 33.

Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ᾗδῃ ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς γένηται ἀπαλὸς καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφύῃ, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος· οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδῃτε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις.

LUKE xxi. 29-31.

Καὶ εἶπεν παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς, "Ἴδετε τὴν συκὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα· ὅταν προβάλῃσιν ᾗδῃ, βλέποντες ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν γινώσκετε ὅτι ᾗδῃ ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν· οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδῃτε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

We have almost absolute identity between the accounts of St Matthew and St Mark. St Luke is not a mere copyist like St Matthew, but has tried to give his version a literary form of his own; yet the substantial agreement is such as to exclude the supposition that he was using any different authority. To *Behold the fig tree*, St Luke adds *and all the trees*. He seems to have asked himself, Why the fig tree in particular? Does it show more signs of coming summer than other trees? I am not botanist enough to know whether it does or not; but it is plain that St Luke himself would not have thought it necessary to make special mention of the fig tree; and that, therefore, he must be copying a source which did make mention of that tree. My conjecture is that the mention of it in the common source of the Synoptics was suggested by its occurrence in Isaiah xxxiv. 4, which the Evangelist has been using just before, *The host of heaven . . . shall fade away, as the leaf fadeth from off the vine, and as a fading leaf from the fig tree.*

It is worth remarking, perhaps, that *θέρος* is only found in this parable; but in this, in all three Gospels, which falls in with the conclusion already arrived at, that all drew from a common source.

The other two Gospels do not distinctly specify what it is that *is nigh*; but an ordinary reader would suppose that it meant the fulfilment of *all these things*. St Luke says that *the kingdom of God is nigh*, which is a less definite expression.

THE TIME OF THE SECOND COMING

MARK xiii. 30-32.

Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη μέχρις οὗ ταῦτα πάντα γένηται. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ παρελεύσονται. Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

MATT. xxiv. 34-36.

Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ἕως [ἀν] πάντα ταῦτα γένηται. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν. Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μόνος.

LUKE xxi. 32, 33.

Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ἕως [ἀν] πάντα γένηται. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται.

The verse Mark xiii. 30 contains a well-known difficulty; but it is not one either for the textual critic, nor is it one of interpretation in the ordinary sense of the word. Taken by itself, nothing can be more lucid; the hearers would certainly understand it to mean that the prophecy would be completely fulfilled in the lifetime of the then existing generation. They had not yet been taught by events to consider the fall of Jerusalem as separated by a long distance of time from the Second Coming. It was only as that generation was rapidly passing away without any event to justify the Christian expectations, that deferred hope suggested doubts. Did Jesus wilfully deceive? or was He Himself ignorant of what He failed to communicate to His disciples? The former alternative is inadmissible; therefore we are reduced to the second. But then the theologian is presented with a difficulty when he undertakes to define what Jesus was, and to explain how, if He were what we believe Him to have been, He could be ignorant of anything. I shrink from dealing with a question which I hold to be beyond the reach of human faculties, namely, to explain how the Finite and the Infinite could be combined in one Person. But the problem with which I am concerned suggests the question, Was verse 32 of Mark part of the original tradition of our Lord's sayings? or was it added in Church reading, after doubts and speculation had made some explanation necessary? The chief thing which suggests to me doubt on this point is that St Luke has no parallel to this verse of Matthew and Mark, though it seems to me unlikely that if he had found this verse in any document he was using he would have left out the solution of a difficulty likely enough to have perplexed his readers. Whether St Luke knew this verse or not when he wrote his Gospel, he had certainly become acquainted with it when he wrote Acts i. 7, which exactly expresses the same idea, οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶν γινῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ. St Luke fully recognises that

there would be an interval, which he calls *the times of the Gentiles*, between the fall of Jerusalem and the Second Coming, Luke xxi. 24.

Καὶ πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρης καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθή-
σονται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πάντα, καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατου-
μένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν [καὶ ἔσονται] καιροὶ
ἐθνῶν.

This phrase *the times of the Gentiles* expresses the same idea which is more explicitly stated by St Paul (Rom. xi. 25) that *a hardening in part had befallen Israel, only until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in*. The Apocalypse, which is among the earliest of the Christian documents, shews that the Church was even then looking forward to the accession to its numbers of *a great multitude . . . out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues* (vii. 9). And St Matthew (xxiv. 14) implies that *the end* was not to come until the Gospel had first been *preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations*.

Compare Matthew xxiv. 37-41 with Luke xvii. 26-30, 34-36.

EXHORTATION TO WATCHFULNESS

MARK xiii. 33-37.

Βλέπετε ἀγρυπνεῖτε, οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ
πότε ὁ καιρὸς [έστιν]· ὡς ἄνθρωπος
ἀπόδημος ἀφείλς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ
δοὺς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν,
ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ θυρω-
ρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορῇ. γρηγο-
ρεῖτε οὖν, οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ
κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται, ἢ ὅψέ ἢ
μεσονύκτιον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἢ
πρωί, μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐξέφνης εὖρη ὑμᾶς
καθεύδοντας· ὁ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω πάντων
λέγω, γρηγορεῖτε.

MATT. xxiv. 42.

Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε
ποία ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται.

MATT. xxv. 13.

Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν
ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν.

I do not know whether it is worth remarking that St Mark's βλέπετε is replaced in Matthew by γρηγορεῖτε, which, however, appears in Mark xiii. 34, 35, 37. St Luke has ἀγρυπνεῖτε in xxi. 36. St Mark's βλέπετε is a word which he frequently uses in this sense. The

absence of direct parallels in Matthew and Luke to this latter part of Mark arises, as I believe, from the fact that this concluding exhortation is an addition of St Mark's own to replace the concluding part of Matt. xxiv., which he omitted for brevity. I had at one time been of the opinion that St Mark's Gospel was the only source from which St Matthew copied, an hypothesis which fits in very well with what is told in the earlier chapters. But in the later chapters we have constantly the phenomenon of coincidences between Matthew and Luke in passages to which there is nothing corresponding in Mark. These coincidences can only be explained by the supposition that the two later Evangelists, even if they used Mark, as I believe they did, drew also from an earlier source. Thus in the present chapter we have such a coincidence.

MATT. xxiv. 43, 44.

Ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἥδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα φυλακῇ ὁ κλέπτῃς ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἶασεν διορυχθῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοί, ὅτι ἡ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

LUKE xii. 39, 40.

Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἥδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα ὥρα ὁ κλέπτῃς ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἀφήκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοί, ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

The nearly complete identity here shews that our two authorities used a common source (not Mark), and that in this case neither varied from it very much. It will be observed that our Lord gave two illustrations of the danger of unpreparedness: one the case of a householder surprised by a robber, the other that of a careless servant surprised by the unexpected return of his master. Possibly our Lord had used these illustrations before on different occasions. St Matthew has combined both in one discourse; so also does St Luke; but he separates them by a question of Peter's, in answer to which the second illustration is used. According to Luke xii. 41, after the saying about the householder and the robber, Peter puts the question, κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν τάντην λέγεις ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας. It seems to me that St Mark's conclusion, ὃ δὲ

ὑμῖν λέγω πᾶσιν λέγω, γρηγορεῖτε was suggested by this question of Peter's, and therefore that though neither St Mark nor St Matthew report the question, yet that it was possibly derived from the common source; unless any one prefer the solution that St Luke expanded the idea expressed more briefly by St Mark. And no doubt St Luke seems usually, in reporting a saying of our Lord's, to be able at the same time to give an account of the conversation that had suggested it. However this may be, St Luke returns immediately to identity with Matthew.

MATT. xxiv. 45-51.

LUKE xii. 42-46.

It is impossible to compare this passage of Luke with the corresponding section of Matthew without feeling that the coincidences are such as cannot possibly be ascribed to chance. Notwithstanding the great cruelty with which slaves were then treated by bad masters, I cannot think *dichotomising* a punishment likely to be inflicted on a negligent servant, and therefore that the agreement of Matthew and Luke in the use of this word may be counted among the proofs that both used a common authority. Without going into details, it seems to me that St Matthew's version is closer to the original than St Luke's.

On St Luke's words, xii. 38, *If he shall come in the second watch, and if in the third*, a question has been raised why St Luke should here only mention *the second* and *the third*. It seems to me that *the first*, ὁψέ, might well have been omitted, since there would be little merit in staying awake so long; but it has been inferred from the omission of *the fourth* that St Luke used the Jewish computation, and counted only three. It seems to me that St Luke was quite as likely as St Mark to use the Roman phraseology; so, if we are to lay any stress on this omission, I should ascribe its origin to the original Jewish document which St Luke copied faithfully.

Having now convinced myself that the exhortations

to watchfulness which St Mark has given briefly had been given in an original document, to which he had access, at greater length and with fuller illustrations, I do not hesitate to believe that the account of the matter is that St Mark finding that those exhortations to watchfulness were all in natural connexion with the saying which he has reported (verse 32), *Of that day or that hour knoweth no one*, thought it enough for his purpose to give the substance of them at once.

There may be possibly elsewhere traces of acquaintance with some other of the passages which St Mark has here omitted. Thus the *ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος* of Mark xiii. 34 may perhaps be connected with the *ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν* of Matt. xxv. 14; and there may possibly be a recognition of the parable of the Ten Virgins in the directions (Luke xii. 35, 36) that their lamps should be burning, and that they should be like servants waiting for their Lord, when he should return from the marriage feast.

THE LAST PASSOVER

MARK xiv. 1, 2.

MATT. xxvi. 1-5.

LUKE xxii. 1, 2.

In the Passion history we find St Matthew's account closely based on St Mark's, while St Luke appears to have used a different source; but there is no trace of this in these opening verses, which contain nothing but what St Luke might have learnt from Mark, expressed however in words of his own. What St Matthew has added of his own to the account is that this resolution to take Jesus, if possible by guile, in the absence of His eager listeners, was taken by the Chief Priests and Scribes, or, as St Matthew calls them, the elders of the people, in a formal meeting in the hall of the house of Caiaphas. It is evident that the Jewish rulers saw that here would be danger of a serious riot if they attempted

to make Jesus a prisoner while He was surrounded by His Galilean adherents, and possibly by new disciples whom He had gained as hearers of His discourses at Jerusalem. It is possible that it was resolved at this meeting to reward handsomely any one who would enable them to execute a quiet capture; for we read presently that Judas came to them as a volunteer, induced no doubt by the information that was circulated that such a service would be well remunerated.

THE ANOINTING OF OUR LORD'S FEET

MARK xiv. 3-9.

MATT. xxvi. 6-13.

JOHN xii. 1-8.

The identity of Mark and Matthew is so nearly complete that we cannot hesitate to believe that one was derived from the other. We have not an account of St Luke's to compare; for he omits this story here. There is less occasion to account for St Luke's omission than for St Mark's insertion of an anecdote which may seem an irrelevant interruption of the history of our Lord's capture. St Luke had in an early part of his Gospel told a story so similar, that some have thought that it was a different account of the same event; and St Luke, in making a selection of things to be related, might naturally prefer not to tell two so like each other. In the place where he does tell of a woman anointing our Lord, he uses the narrative to introduce a remarkable parable and to teach an important lesson.

LUKE vii. 36-40.

In the introduction to the parable, the Evangelist who thus far had only spoken of the host anonymously as the Pharisee, now reveals that his name was Simon. This was also the name (Mark xiv. 3) of the host on the occasion of the anointing which the other Evangelists

record. This identity of name, combined with the fact that both stories tell of a woman pouring on our Lord the contents of an alabaster box of ointment, are the only reasons why St Luke should be supposed to have been speaking of the same occurrence as the other Evangelists. Yet the name Simon was too common among the Jews to permit us to lay much stress on this coincidence. My theories about the inspiration of the Gospels do not forbid me to accept the supposition that one of the incidents preserved in the tradition of the Church, and taught in its public recitation of the Saviour's acts, might be differently placed by two of those who, in the Divine Providence, were entrusted with the task of giving to that tradition the more secure permanence of a written record. Nor again, should I be much distressed by the discrepancy that in one case the woman is described as pouring the ointment on our Lord's head, and in the other on His feet. Such a difference at least might easily occur in the report of two different witnesses of the same incident; but if we have found reason to believe that St Luke was acquainted with a narrative substantially the same as that of the Gospel of St Mark, it is not likely that he would go out of his way to vary from it needlessly.

The difference is at once accounted for when it is understood that different persons are spoken of. The woman who had been a sinner dared no more than to come behind the great Teacher and anoint His feet; such diffidence was not to be expected in a loving friend. St Luke's story all through turns on the fact that the woman was a sinner, all leads up to an inference not suggested in St Mark's narrative, viz., that what men might account as the unworthiness of the object of our Lord's mercy was so far from being an absolute hindrance to acceptance by Him, that the very greatness of the sins forgiven might generate a love more ardent than that felt by one who had never fallen. It is repugnant to our feelings to believe that this dark spot rested on the character of a member of the family which

our Lord regarded with special love. The thing no doubt was possible ; and we are not bound to suppose that if Mary, the sister of Lazarus, had so sinned, our Lord would have put her from Him as utterly beyond the reach of His forgiveness and favour. Nevertheless, the imputation is one that we are not warranted in casting, on a mere surmise, and without any evidence to support it.

The story of our Lord's anointing which is told by St Matthew and St Mark in almost identical words, is told also with substantial agreement in St John's Gospel. I have purposely avoided comparison with this Gospel in treating of the story told by the Synoptics. I could not do so without a separate discussion of the credit to be attached to the statements of that Gospel, an investigation which would demand a treatise in itself. It is, moreover, as all agree, considerably later than the other three ; and, therefore, if it were the case that it contradicted the earlier accounts, it might naturally be regarded as of less authority than they. But undoubtedly it may to a certain extent be used in interpreting these accounts, as showing what meaning was attached to them before the end of the first century ; for I do not think that the Fourth Gospel can be placed later ; and if it was not written by the Apostle John, it must at least have been written by a disciple of his, who claimed to speak with his authority.

It is to be noted that this is not St John's first mention of the anointing. Before his own relation of it, in his first mention of Lazarus (xi. 1), he describes Bethany as *the village of Mary and her sister Martha*, characters whom he assumes to be already well known to his readers ; and adds that this Mary was the same woman as she who had anointed our Lord's feet and wiped them with her hair. I infer from this assumption that his readers were already acquainted with the story of the anointing, that the Fourth Evangelist was aware that other Gospels than his own had been previously in circulation among Christians ; and, as the story

proceeds, we find reason to believe that the Gospels both of St Luke and St Mark were known to the writer. Thus we may infer an acquaintance with Luke x. 38-42, which would not only have made his readers familiar with the names of Mary and Martha, but would have prepared them to read without surprise that while Martha was described as in attendance on the guests, no mention was made of Mary as similarly employed. But the most striking point of agreement is that St John adopts the statement in Luke vii. that it was on our Lord's feet that the woman poured the ointment. Notwithstanding my own strong impression that the sinner of Luke vii. was not the Mary of John xii., I cannot in candour deny that St John's language conveys the idea that this Evangelist regarded the two women as the same. In fact, on reflection, I recant my opinion that St John made a literary blunder in speaking of the anointment of our Lord before he had related it. What I now understand him to say is, This Mary was the woman of whom St Luke tells as having anointed our Lord before; and I have now to tell how she again repeated her act. In short, St John did not, like modern critics, believe that there was but one anointing, which St Luke has wrongly placed. He holds that there were two.

The scene of the anointing was, according to Mark xiv. 3, *the house of Simon the leper*. We learn from Luke x. 38 that Martha had a house of her own. We also know from John xi. 19 that the sisters had many Jewish friends; and therefore we seem to have reason to think that the entertainment was given in the house of this Simon, to whom Martha gave her services in waiting on the guests. The sisters do not seem to have been wealthy women, for they do not appear to have kept slave or hired servant, and are not likely to have given such an entertainment as the phrase ἐποίησαν δεῖπνον suggests. The dinner to which Lazarus was invited was probably in celebration of his unexpected recovery. The anointing related by St Luke took

place in the house of a rich Pharisee; and such Simon may have been. His wealth may have been enough to incline the priestly inspectors to take a lenient view of his case, and to judge that the symptoms of the disease were not so grave as to make separation necessary. But the title *ὁ λεπρός* does not necessarily imply that the man was suffering from the disease at the time; for, as Jerome has remarked, the title may have clung to him after his recovery, just as Matthew was known as *ὁ τελώνης*, notwithstanding his having given up his business on joining our Lord.

If we had doubted St John's obligation to Mark, we could not hesitate when we find John agreeing with Mark in describing the ointment as *νάρδος πιστική*. Matthew omits this adjective, which was apparently a technical word, and one as to the exact meaning of which interpreters are not yet quite agreed, and which seems to have puzzled some of the early Latin translators. It seems to have been the local name of that particular kind of spikenard. If not, *genuine* seems the best translation of the word; for even then tradesmen had learnt to substitute an inferior article for one in much demand. John's *μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου* is also much closer to Mark's *μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς* than Matthew's *μύρου βαρυτίμου*, or, according to some MSS., *πολυτίμου*.

The relation of the anointing in this place may be thought an insertion by St Mark which breaks the continuity of the context. In verse 2 we are told how the Jewish rulers were desirous to destroy Jesus, but saw the necessity of doing it with subtilty, so as to avoid a tumult of the people. This prepares the way for verse 10, which tells how the desired opportunity was afforded them by the treachery of Judas, who guided the pursuers where they could take Him in the absence of the multitude. Between the two is interpolated the seemingly irrelevant story of the anointing. We are not bound to suppose that St Mark meant to convey that the anointing took place exactly two days before

the Passover. The Fourth Gospel says six days; and St Mark does not contradict. He gives two days as the interval between the date when the rulers decided on destroying Jesus and the time when they found means to carry their resolution into effect; but we are left free to suppose that the anointing had taken place at a different time. But why then relate the story just here? St John suggests an answer to this question, whether it was what St Mark intended or not. St John tells us that it was Judas who complained of the waste of the expensive ointment; and moreover, that the source of his complaint was disappointment at the diversion of funds which otherwise would have come into his own keeping. He suggests that Judas would have used the trust dishonestly; and certainly the intensity of feeling against Judas which the Fourth Gospel exhibits harmonises well with the traditional account that that Gospel was written by one of the circle in which the treachery of a once trusted friend must naturally have excited the most lively indignation and loathing. St Matthew certainly seems to have understood the history as connecting the disaffection of Judas with our Lord's answer to the murmuring against the extravagance of the woman's devotion; for in Matt. xxvi. 14 he connects the two incidents with a τότε πορευθείς. The case is not, as we might have imagined, that Judas had not been able to resist a bribe offered to him by the chief priests; but he goes to them, and volunteers his services, and that just immediately after his views had been rejected by his Master. All this hangs together so well that what is surprising is how little direct countenance is given to the combination by St Mark, from whose narration the other accounts have every appearance of having been derived.

According to Matthew, who uses the aorist ἡγανάκτησαν, the disciples' dissatisfaction found vent in a single definite exclamation *To what purpose is this waste?* We can well believe, what St John suggests, that it was Judas who uttered it. Mark's ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες

πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς expresses a general feeling among the disciples, uttered in reproaches to the woman for her thoughtless and useless expenditure. But it was this censure which elicited our Lord's approval of her action. No doubt it was natural for them to think that their Master, like themselves, would disapprove this extravagant expenditure of a large sum, squandered on a piece of luxury which left behind no permanent benefit, and which might have been more wisely bestowed in keeping up the charities and the maintenance of their little community. But the report of our Lord's answer carries conviction of its authenticity from its accordance with the circumstances. Jesus knew the hollowness of the hopes which buoyed up His ardent followers, and had warned them that His death was impending. What more natural than that He should say, Why take umbrage at the expense which she is lavishing on me? neither she nor you will have me long; this anointing is but an anticipation of the anointment of a corpse previously to its burial.

THE TREACHERY OF JUDAS

MARK xiv. 10, 11.

MATT. xxvi. 14-16.

LUKE xxii. 3-6.

As to the question whether Judas was actuated by mere greed, or whether he had taken offence at something said by his Master, I do not lay much stress on the fact that his visit to the Chief Priests was volunteered, and that the promise of a reward came afterwards. I think that Judas called in answer to an advertisement. Although some modern speculators have suggested more creditable motives which might have disposed Judas to play the part of traitor, the New Testament writers make no suggestion that he was actuated by any other motive than greed. As a cool-headed man, he must have been convinced that

488 PREPARATIONS FOR THE PASSOVER

an attempt to proclaim Jesus as the successor of David must end in the destruction of all who took part in it. What must he have felt when he discovered that Jesus Himself was of the same opinion, and was looking forward to His own death as inevitable? Why should he remain in the sinking ship? Possibly his dissent from the views of the leading Apostles had been expressed before, and had been lightly regarded. Why should he tie himself any longer to a hopeless cause? Why not transfer himself to the side of the rulers, who would give him money at once, and, no doubt, favour and promotion in the future? The death of his Master was certain; and he might reflect, as his patriarch namesake had done before, Was there to be no profit in shedding His blood?

I do not think we can lay much stress on St Matthew's statement of the exact amount which Judas received. Neither Mark, Luke, nor John show any acquaintance with the sum — thirty pieces of silver. But it must have been a favourite topic with the early Christian preachers to trace the agreement of our Lord's life with the Old Testament predictions; and St Matthew's Gospel abounds in such illustrations. The striking text *ἔστησαν τὸν μισθόν μου τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς* (Zechariah xi. 12) could not be overlooked as a prediction that a price was also to be set on the Messiah.

THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE PASSOVER

MARK xiv. 12-16.

MATT. xxvi. 17-19.

LUKE xxii. 7-13.

On comparing these three accounts we can at once see that St Matthew's is independent of St Mark's. He says nothing about the man with the pitcher of water, but simply tells that they were to prepare the Passover in a house which Jesus named. St Luke's account, on

the other hand, follows St Mark's closely. The only new detail which St Luke gives is that the names of the two disciples were Peter and John. From one of these two the story must have come to the Evangelist. It is therefore borrowing but little from tradition, if we assume that St Peter was St Mark's informant. We know from the Acts that Mark and Luke were fellow-travellers in Paul's company; and it would have been natural and easy for him to obtain from St Mark the names of the two disciples; and it is interesting to find that St Peter had taught St Mark to suppress his name in the public account.

As the story is told by St Mark, we should conclude that Jesus had, on this occasion, showed a prophetic knowledge, such as was exhibited by Samuel, when, on parting with Saul, he told him whom he should meet on the way. Not a trace of this appears in St Matthew's account. This small difference could be explained by the supposition that instructions had been given to John which were not communicated to Peter. The Fourth Gospel represents John as previously acquainted with Jerusalem, and as on terms of special intimacy with our Lord. John might have known well whither he was going, even if he did not, as was quite possible, recognise the man bearing the pitcher of water. To Peter, who followed in his company, the guidance of the man with the pitcher might have seemed strange and miraculous. If we could lay stress on the pronoun, the phrase *τὸ κατάλυμά μου* would convey the idea that the accommodation had been secured beforehand. The pitcher may have been an appointed signal; for apprehensions of treachery might well have dictated the precaution of not publishing beforehand where it was intended to hold the Paschal feast.

Assuming, as we must, that the Crucifixion took place on the Friday, the events here related must have happened on the day before, Thursday. The Mosaic ordinance was that unleavened bread must be used for seven days; and that on the evening of the first of

these days the Paschal lamb was to be slain. Whatever explanation is to be given of the divergence of the account in the Fourth Gospel, there is no ambiguity as to what the Synoptic Gospels intend to convey, namely, that the mission of the two disciples took place on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread ; that is to say, the day on which the lamb that was to be eaten in the evening was to be killed. The two disciples had no work to do on the room, which had been already prepared ; their business was clearly to procure the lamb and prepare it for the Passover meal. Note the addition made in Matthew's account, *ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγύς ἐστίν*.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF TREASON

MARK xiv. 17-21. MATT. xxvi. 20-25. LUKE xxii. 14, 21-23.

I think I have already noted that the concealment of where they were to hold the Passover feast, may have arisen from our Lord's knowledge of the untrustworthiness of His company. If Judas had known earlier, he would probably have brought the soldiers to the house where they were assembled. St John fills up a gap in the story by making Judas leave the company after this denouncement. Otherwise it needed explanation why he was not with the other disciples on the Mount of Olives. But query? were all the Twelve supposed to be there present, or only the chosen three?

THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST

MARK xiv. 22-26. Matt. xxvi. 26-30. LUKE xxii. 15-20, 39.

On comparing these three accounts we are struck by the practical identity of those given by St Matthew and St Mark ; St Matthew's being only St Mark's a

little enlarged, while St Luke's diverges a good deal. This divergence is what might have been expected, if we had thought about it. All the evidence convinces us that the breaking of bread in commemoration of Christ's death formed, from times as early as we can trace, an essential part of the weekly Christian service. That the reading of the account of the initiation of this rite formed a regular part of that service in the earliest times, as it has done as long as we have records of Christian ritual, is a thing in perfect conformity with what might have been expected. We probably have in Matthew and Mark the story as it was told in the Palestinian Church, and, after that, in the Roman Church established by Jewish missionaries. St Luke was a traveller, and must have heard the forms used in various churches. The Pauline churches no doubt used the form which they had been taught by their founder. I believe this is how we are to account for coincidences between St Luke's account and that of St Paul in the Epistle to the Corinthians. If these coincidences had been introduced by transcribers, why should they not have appeared in other Gospels as well as in St Luke's? But St Luke's Gospel probably shows "contamination," that is to say, a certain mixture of the Pauline version with that previously put in writing by St Mark.

I must say that St Luke's opening sentence carries to my mind internal evidence of its authenticity, such that I am persuaded it must have come from a well informed source. Consider the situation: Our Lord was well aware that the Jewish rulers were determined to take His life; and He had now reason to think that His disciples were not all loyal to Him, while those who were so had no power to defend Him. That the blow must soon fall He knew; but how soon was still uncertain. How natural it is that He should long to eat one more Passover with His disciples before He left them. Imagine a man with a mortal disease who, as December went on, had doubted much whether

He should live over Christmas Day, and think of his saying to his family when the day arrived, "How I have been longing to spend one more Christmas Day with you; but this will be the last." To me the saying about drinking wine in the kingdom of God had always seemed mysterious; but it gains immensely in human interest when I think of Jesus as saying to His disciples, "How I have longed to eat of this Passover with you; but never more shall I eat it, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God." Does this saying mean, I shall never taste wine again? or merely, I shall never taste another Passover cup?

Our Lord had apparently handed to each of the disciples a fragment of the broken bread, but not so with regard to the wine. He handed them the cup, and directed them to distribute it among themselves; that is, to pass it on from one to the other; and so they did until all had drunk of it. We are not warranted in concluding, as some have done, that He had not first drunk of it Himself; it would not have been a real keeping of the Passover if He had not done so. And the words ἀπὲ τοῦ νῦν, declaring that He would not drink of it after the present time, convey as clearly that He did drink of it at that present time.

I do not think it correct to say that St Luke puts the cup before the bread; I should not be startled if he had done so; for I should conclude that he had but preserved the order of the Passover feast, in which we are told that the beginning was the passing round of the cup; but I cannot see that St Luke had any intention of deviating from the usual order. He mentions in due order first our Lord's saying that He would not eat another Passover, and then His saying that He would not drink again of the fruit of the vine. And after that he goes on to tell, first the solemn breaking and delivery of the bread, with the words *This is my body*, and after that, in like manner, the cup, with the words *This cup is the new covenant in my blood*.

I must reject as unfounded the suspicions that have

been raised as to the genuineness of the section from τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον (verse 19) to the end of verse 20. The MS. evidence for the words is overwhelming, the Eastern testimony for them being unanimous, and the Western testimony being divided. All that can be said is that, however we are to account for it, a text which omitted this section obtained some currency in the West. It is no reason for suspecting these verses that they correspond closely with St Paul's account of the institution of the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians. Why should they not correspond? Why should St Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, give a different account from that recited in the services of the Church with which St Luke must have been acquainted? On the other hand, if the clauses had not been originally in the text, how come the Eastern witnesses all to agree in inserting them, and that in words which, though in the main agreeing with St Paul, have some serious points of difference? The omission of the words leaves a gaping wound: the bread is declared to be the Lord's body, but the cup is not connected with His blood. That St Luke should have so differed from the previous Evangelists is chronologically inexplicable. We can readily concede that, as the Church grew in knowledge, the expression of doctrine in liturgical forms might have become more express; but we cannot understand a retrograde step. Is it possible that St Luke can represent a view of Eucharistic doctrine, not held either by the Evangelists who preceded him, or by the Church teachers who followed him?

When we have had evidence to determine which is the right reading, it is, no doubt, an important confirmation of our judgment if we can also account for the origin of the wrong reading; but our failure to do so does not prove that our judgment had been wrong. We know little of the history of MSS.; and it is quite conceivable that an accidental error of transcription, or the false judgment of an early critic, may have propagated itself in a small family of MSS. In the present case, it is possible that an early critic may have taken

umbrage at the return to mention of the cup after it had been already spoken of in verse 17.

THE WARNING TO PETER

MARK xiv. 27-31.

MATT. xxvi. 31-35.

LUKE xxii. 31-34.

JOHN xiii. 36-38.

St Matthew's version is evidently based on St Mark's, in which he only makes a few verbal alterations. The citation from Zech. xiii. 7 does not correspond with the LXX., as we have it now, which runs *πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τὰ πρόβατα*. We have no right to demand verbal accuracy of citation in the case of words probably originally spoken in Aramaic; but we are probably right in inferring that the version used by St Mark differed somewhat from the LXX. as we have it now.

Verse 28.—*I will go before you into Galilee*—seems irrelevant here; and the disciples do not notice it in their reply. We can understand their want of interest in what He says will happen after His rising again—a phrase which they were slow to comprehend. The best explanation I can give of its relevance here is that the meaning is, Though the sheep be scattered, yet I will meet you in Galilee, and gather you again.

Though what has been preserved of St Mark's Gospel (which Gospel seems to have had a narrow escape from total destruction) does not contain the story of the Resurrection, it seems clear that it had originally done so; and, moreover, that it had told of an appearance in Galilee, although St Luke represents our Lord as directing His disciples to remain in Jerusalem until the Day of Pentecost, and only tells of appearances of our Lord in that city. I do not think St Luke could have known St Mark's Gospel as a written document; and, as I have already intimated, was, in my opinion,

only acquainted with those portions of it which he had heard orally recited.

Verse 31.—Note Mark's word ἐλάλει, not a single utterance, but a chattering repetition of his resolution never to desert his Master. Note also Mark's imperfect, ἔλεγον, with regard to what the other disciples said. St Mark's sense of propriety of language would not allow him to use εἶπαν of what was not a single utterance, but a common sentiment probably expressed in different language by the different disciples.

GETHSEMANE

MARK xiv. 32-42.

MATT. xxvi. 36-46.

LUKE xxii. 40-46.

St Luke tells us (xxi. 37) that on the occasion of this visit to Jerusalem, our Lord's custom was to teach in the Temple daily, and to spend the night on the Mount of Olives. And St John (xviii. 2) has copied him, in representing this as a common place of resort of our Lord and His disciples. Arrived at the accustomed place, He leaves the body of His little company sitting there, while He with a chosen three proceeds to a more retired place, where He prays. We are, then, not bound to suppose that Judas had separated himself finally from their company; even if we accept St John's account that he had gone out in the middle of the Passover feast. Left behind there when our Lord and the three departed, he had still plenty of time to go to the chief priests with definite information where Jesus was then to be found, and was qualified to act as guide to the band sent to take Him. St Matthew has copied St Mark's account with merely stylistic variations, but St Luke seems to have had access to a different source. He does not tell of the separation of the three chosen witnesses; whether he himself omitted it for brevity, or that he did not find it mentioned in his source.

But why did not our Lord go alone to pray, as we read of His doing on former occasions (Mark i. 35; vi. 46)? It may be that, in His great depression of spirits, He felt the need of the cheering neighbourhood of friends. But it may be also that He wished them to keep watch, and warn Him of the approach of enemies. He had prayed that this cup might pass from Him without His having to drink it; and He could not consistently omit to use the human precautions which the circumstances required. Thus we can understand His disappointment at finding them asleep every time He came to them, until at length it was He who had to tell them of the approach of enemies of which, if they had been vigilant, they should have warned Him. Thus we can understand the reproach conveyed in His address, *Sleep on now*: Your keeping awake any longer is useless as far as I am concerned; but enemies are at hand, and, for your own sake, you had better be stirring.

It was not wonderful that they should sleep; for though He clearly knew that that very night an attempt to seize Him was to be expected, they did not share His knowledge; and to stay awake all night is not easy for men who have no pain or anxiety to banish sleep.

It is a little odd that St Luke should represent our Lord as saying to the slumbering disciples, *Stand up and pray*. He had not been standing Himself when praying, though undoubtedly standing was the usual attitude of prayer (Luke xviii. 11, 13). Certainly on this occasion it would have been the attitude most likely to keep the worshippers awake.

Something ought to be said about what St Luke has added, viz., the story of the Bloody Sweat and the Ministering Angel. On general considerations I am well disposed to believe that this little section has St Luke's authority. In this part of the narrative St Luke is using an authority different from that employed by St Mark, and one in the faithfulness of whose report

there is good reason to believe. And even if we did not give credence to the story itself, we should have no reason to think it incredible that it had been told by eye-witnesses. They had been just roused from sleep, and must have been struck by the shattered aspect of their Master who was dropping sweat, which may have had all the appearance of blood; and they may have seen, or supposed themselves to have seen, a stranger helping Him. We have, then, only to consider the external evidence for the genuineness of this section; and though it is found in the vast majority of MSS., yet it is absent from B and from the few other consentient authorities, which, as I believe, represent to us the earliest form of the Gospel text which reached Alexandria. At the same time, it must be noted that this section is supported by extremely ancient testimony, being used without doubt by Irenæus, and probably also by Justin Martyr. Whence then did this section derive its origin? It is impossible to believe that it was the invention of a scribe or editor. It could not have gained the acceptance which it actually did obtain if it had not come from some one entitled to speak with authority. I can think of no one so likely to have added it to the original text as St Luke himself, who in this whole story of the Passion evidently had access to some peculiar sources of information. There is no New Testament book so likely to have received a double edition as St Luke's Gospel, because some time after it had been published the author followed it up with a continuation. In the interval, he had travelled, and must no doubt have heard the Gospel story as told in more ancient churches than one. The story of the Ascension as told in the Gospel is certainly modified in the Acts. There is no intrinsic improbability in the supposition that at the time of publishing the second treatise the author made a few alterations in the earlier account. This seems to me far the most plausible account that can be given both of the absence of this section from the form of the Gospel

of whose antiquity we have the best evidence, and nevertheless for its presence in the text which ultimately obtained predominance, and which certainly dates from a very early time.

THE CAPTURE

MARK xiv. 43-52. MATT. xxvi. 47-56. LUKE xxii. 47-53.

Judas now comes up, followed by an armed multitude. Some of them had only clubs or sticks; these were probably only the ordinary Temple guard. Those with swords may have been soldiers, though we are not necessarily bound to suppose so, seeing that some in our Lord's own company had swords. There was certainly one sword (Peter's) among our Lord's attendants, and, according to St Luke's account (xxii. 38), there was another. St Luke represents our Lord as using language in reference to these changed circumstances which would easily be understood by the disciples as an encouragement to them to come armed. It was probably, in any case, a prudent precaution for people spending a night on the Mount of Olives, at a time when the city was unusually thronged by strangers.

It is evident that the object of the Jewish rulers was to apprehend only Jesus Himself, and that no commission had been given to arrest His followers; for a signal had been arranged by which the leader was to be known. How hateful that sign was need not be enlarged on. Nothing perhaps has helped more to brand an eternal stigma on the name of Judas.

None of the Synoptics gives the name of the disciple who attempted resistance. But he must have been one of the three whom our Lord had taken with Him, and there is no reason why we should hesitate to accept St John's statement that it was Peter. This must have

been the received opinion when the Fourth Gospel was written. We must accept St Mark's Gospel as giving the story in the form in which St Peter had been accustomed to deliver it; and it is extremely doubtful whether St Matthew had independent sources of information. The other eight Apostles were not present, and could not give it. On some other occasions when St Mark reports things as said by the Apostles generally, other Evangelists give us reason to think that the spokesman was Peter, and it is not surprising that he should here omit his own name. This time Peter certainly showed no want of courage. Even if, as is likely, Judas had gone on in advance of his company, Peter could not have doubted that he was in the presence of force against which resistance was, humanly speaking, hopeless. But we should think ill of him if, when hands were laid on his Master, he having a weapon in his hands, did not strike a blow with it, without counting the odds.

Our Lord's expostulation, *Are ye come out as against a robber?* is represented by St Luke as addressed to *the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders, which were come out against Him*. St Mark only describes the captors as sent by these people. Of course the expostulation was addressed, not to the soldiers, but to the persons in command, who were no doubt members of the body which was responsible for the attempt.

Mark xiv. 51.—This young man in undress, who is only mentioned by Mark, could not have been one of the attendants on our Lord who had come with Him, and yet nevertheless was a sympathiser. The disciples in their flight could scarcely mark the incident, and I do not know from whom St Mark could have learnt it save from the young man himself; and it is an extremely probable conjecture that St Mark was the young man. It is not a much further advance on the conjectural road to imagine that it was in Mark's mother's house that the Passover feast had been held. If so, Mark might have heard the party leave the house; but

some considerable time must have passed before the capture. On this supposition, Mark might have lain down to sleep, and only rushed out on hearing the noise of the soldiers passing, and without waiting to further clothe himself.

THE TRIAL

MARK xiv. 53, 54.

MATT. xxvi. 57, 58.

LUKE xxii. 54, 55.

MARK xiv. 55-59.

MATT. xxvi. 59-61.

In this, as in so many other sections, the accounts given by St Matthew and St Mark so verbally agree that we must conclude either that St Matthew has abridged Mark, or that St Mark has amplified Matthew. I usually prefer the hypothesis that St Matthew simply used St Mark's Gospel. In the present case, I am more disposed to think that an earlier account is the basis both of Matthew and Mark.

We have no cause for wonder that St Luke does not attempt to relate the proceedings before the Council, at which we have no reason to think that his informants were present. What is to be wondered at is that the other Evangelists were able to give a report of these proceedings; and the question suggests itself, Through whom did they get their information? The report we have does not conceal that the leading members of the Council were hostile to Jesus; yet we must be struck by the judicial fairness of the proceedings. We know from all the Evangelists that one member of the Council, Joseph of Arimathea, if not actually a disciple of our Lord, was so far in sympathy with Him that he too *was looking for the kingdom of God*. After our Lord's death, this Joseph had the courage to go in and ask Pilate for our Lord's body. There was therefore at least one person who could give information about the

proceedings in the Council ; and it may well be believed that he did what he could to prevent the condemnation. Possibly our Lord had other secret adherents in the Council, of whom St John enables us to name one, Nicodemus. In any case Joseph could resist successfully any irregularity which conflicted with the red tape adherence to rule, which was a characteristic of Jewish expounders of the law.

We cannot doubt that Jesus had in His public teaching said much that gave offence to the Jewish rulers, but it would not have been easy to show that any of His sayings amounted to such blasphemy as under the Jewish law would justify condemnation to death. If any witnesses reported His sayings with the aggravation necessary to give them the character of blasphemy, it may well be believed that such witnesses did not agree together. At length, we are told, there came witnesses who brought a charge which seemed to be successful, and which we know had a certain foundation in fact, viz., that He had said He would destroy the Temple and build it up in three days. With respect to this charge it may be questioned whether St Matthew's account or St Mark's has tokens of greater antiquity. Mark contrasts a Temple *made with hands* against one *not made with hands*. This contrast between *χειροποίητος* and *ἀχειροποίητος* comes out strongly in the speech of Stephen, when he had to defend himself against the very accusation that was brought against our Lord. The latter adjective is also employed by St Paul, 2 Cor. v. 1. ; see also Heb. ix. 11. It may seem less likely that St Matthew should have omitted these adjectives than that a companion of St Paul's should have introduced them ; and, therefore, as far as this argument goes, it tells in favour of the conclusion that St Matthew has preserved an earlier tradition than St Mark's.

We may count it as certain that our Lord did speak of a rising after three days ; but the question arises, Did He so speak in the hearing of any but His disciples ?

Even if He did, the two witnesses of whom Matthew tells might have been forthcoming; one at least might certainly have been had. The character of Judas cannot well be made worse by a little more blackening; and we have no ground to think that he would have refused to earn his pay by giving the testimony which was necessary to secure our Lord's condemnation, seeing that he would not have to say anything that was not perfectly true. But it is more likely that the words were spoken publicly. I can well believe that in the very last public discourse of our Lord there was included such a prophecy of the destruction of the city, as St Luke reports Him to have made privately a few days before. The exclamation of the disciple, *Master, behold, what manner of stones and what manner of buildings!* may not have been suggested by æsthetic admiration of their grandeur, but may rather have expressed a doubt whether a building so stable must not escape any general destruction.

But the whole point of the accusation of blasphemy turned on the words *I will destroy this Temple*. There was no more blasphemy in prophesying the destruction of the Temple than when Micah foretold that Zion should be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem become heaps (Jer. xxvi. 18). It is likely that it was on this vital point that the witnesses disagreed, and that thus there was a failure of legal proof by two witnesses that a blasphemy had been spoken. Then the High Priest solved the difficulty by making the accused Person bear witness against Himself; and it is here that St Luke again takes up the tale.

THE SENTENCE OF CONDEMNATION

MARK xiv. 60-65.

MATT. xxvi. 62-68.

LUKE xxii. 63-71.

It does not appear whether the discrepancy of the evidence was commented on by any member of the

Council. At all events, this last topic of evidence seems to have struck the High Priest as more formidable than any that had been produced before. He got up from his seat, and coming forward, asked what defence the accused Person had to offer. Jesus was silent; and although I do not think we are obliged to believe that He actually used the words put into His mouth by St Luke, I believe that they truly express the reason for His silence, namely, the felt uselessness of arguing with men who had already determined on His condemnation. Then the High Priest called on Him to say whether He really claimed to be *the Christ, the Son of the Blessed*. And although St Mark does not attest it, I have no hesitation in accepting St Matthew's statement that the question was put with such a solemn form of adjuration as might be expected to enforce an answer from one who seemed obstinately resolved to be silent. Jesus then could no longer refuse to give a distinct answer; and Matthew's form $\sigmaὺ \epsilonἶπας$ and Mark's $\epsilonἰπὼν \epsilonἰμι$ clearly mean the same thing. And He goes on to say that thereafter they shall see *the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Omnipotence and coming with the clouds of heaven*. The High Priest, shocked at such a claim, rent his two inner garments, an act used not only as a token of mourning, but also of horror at blasphemy (see Isaiah xxxvi. 22; xxxvii. 1; Jer. xxxvi. 24; 2 Kings xxii. 11). And the rest of the Council sympathised. I do not know whether we are entitled to lay stress on St Mark's $\piάντες$, in verse 64, as denoting that there were no exceptions to the general unanimity; but evidently, if Joseph of Arimathea or others did not agree, they were powerless to resist the general feeling.

While the accounts agree as to the insulting treatment inflicted on our Lord by His captors, they differ as to the time when it was done, and as to the persons who were guilty of it. The difference, however, is not so much as to what took place, as to what the

Evangelists thought fit to record ; for the accounts do not contradict each other, though one may be used to supplement the other.

According to St Luke's account, we find that when our Lord was brought to the High Priest's house, the night was already far advanced. The members of the Sanhedrim were then summoned, and their Council was assembled in the early morning. Then the order of St Luke's narration suggests that during the interval, while the Council was being assembled, the rude captors, in whose hands Jesus remained, treated Him with brutal insult, mocking Him and beating Him ; their favourite sport being to blindfold Him and test His gift of prophecy by trying whether He could name the person who struck Him.

That such things were done is in itself highly probable. There is no point in which modern humanity has more ameliorated the condition of the unfortunate than in the treatment of criminals both before and after their conviction. When I speak of this humanity as *modern*, I might perhaps have said *recent* ; for up to the time of Howard, I do not know that much advance had been made in tenderness of treatment of prisoners since the time of the Roman Empire. At present, our theory is that, up to the time of conviction, we ought to proceed on the supposition that the accused person is innocent ; although we cannot help knowing that in the vast majority of cases the presumption is quite the other way. In earlier times, men went on the presumption that the accused person was probably guilty, and this was even then more often the case than not ; though not so generally as now. Jailors or others who had the custody of accused persons were responsible for their safe keeping, and were subject to severe penalties if they were remiss in that duty. If they were naturally humane they would not treat their prisoners with undue severity ; but they were themselves the judges how much strictness was essential to security ; and they were not liable

to punishment for excess, as they would have been for unwise leniency. It might, therefore, have been taken as antecedently probable that our Lord would receive much brutal usage before ever being brought to trial before the Council.

We are inclined to ask whether Peter was a witness of this treatment; for we find him calmly sitting round the fire with the *ὑπηρέται*, among whom no doubt were some of our Lord's captors. I suppose the answer to be that the time when Peter was thus sitting was that later period when our Lord was actually under examination before the Council. We are told that Peter followed our Lord and His captors *at a distance*; and we can scarcely suppose that he entered the palace in their company. But no doubt many were employed on that service who were not known to the High Priest's servants as ordinary frequenters of the palace. There was no need that special vigilance should be used as to the admission of strangers. The followers of Jesus had received no notice of the intended capture. Any one who sought for admission while it was still night might be assumed to be on the side of the rulers. The Fourth Gospel explains that Peter obtained admission through his friend's acquaintance with the door-keeper. But even if we had not that explanation, we could easily conceive that Peter, hanging about the place, when he saw different rabbis entering with their attendants, in obedience to the summons to the Council, and obtaining admission without question, might have taken courage to join one of these companies, and enter unchallenged by the porter. This, however, would not be until our Lord's tormentors had had enough of their cruel sport.

The point at which St Mark, followed by St Matthew, gives his account of these insults is immediately after our Lord's condemnation. It is then, we are told, that some spat on Him, and beat Him with fists, and covered His face, challenging Him when blindfolded to name each assailant; and we are told that the

officers joined in beating Him. To spit in our Lord's face, and to cover His face, are a little inconsistent; accordingly St Matthew, who records the former, says nothing about the latter, though the blindfolding of their prisoner is an essential part of the story of the mocking challenge to Him to name the person who struck Him. St Mark, who records the covering His face, does not say that they spat in it. No doubt both insults were inflicted; first one, then the other. The inference plainly is that the insult was originated by members of the Council, and that the *officers* presently joined in. In our time, when a man has been sentenced to death, we do not think it right to add to his sufferings by preliminary torture; but it was not so in former days; if bystanders, in their indignation, added to what had been sentenced by the judge, all this was looked on as no more than giving the criminal his deserts; and this volunteered addition to the judge's sentence was no doubt the severest part of the penalty. Many a Christian martyr since, cheered by the sympathy of brother disciples, has exulted in submitting to what he felt to be a glory, not a shame. But there was no glory in dying the death of a detected impostor, exposed to ignominy as one who had imagined himself able to save others, and now proved to be unable to save himself.

In the case of a criminal, condemned by Roman law to death, a preliminary flogging was an ordinary way of carrying out the sentence. Part, no doubt, was inflicted by specially authorised operators; but no objection was made if officials or bystanders expressed their indignation at the crime by adding more. The exercise of power is always pleasant, and may easily pass into cruelty, when no sympathy is felt with the sufferer. I am old enough to have seen the spectacle of a man in the pillory, a punishment which in itself inflicted no pain; but which set up the criminal as a mark for the missiles of the populace, such as were sure to be hurled, not only if there were a popular

feeling against the sufferer, but unless there were actually sympathy for him. If there were, the pillory might be a place of triumph; but sympathy for criminals is of quite as modern growth as sympathy for a baited bull. The honest truth is that man is a cruel animal, until education has taught him to feel for and with others.

THE DENIAL OF PETER

MARK xiv. 66-72.

MATT. xxvi. 69-75.

LUKE xxii. 56-62.

The scene of this incident is a portion of the High Priest's palace; Mark describes it as *κατ'ω*, Matthew as *ἐξω*. I conclude that it was an open court within the outside gate, but at the foot of the stairs which ascended to the assembly room of the Council. It was the equinoctial season, and the night was cold; so the *officers* had lit a fire in the midst of the court, and Peter seated himself with them in the circle that was attracted round the fire. It was not yet good daylight, and it was by the light of the fire that a maid-servant detected in Peter the presence of a stranger. It may be that she had seen him in the city with his Master, and was able to recognise him as a companion of the Nazarene.

Up to this Peter had showed no lack of courage; and indeed had reason to pride himself on his bravery in venturing so far. But now he was taken by surprise, and obeyed a natural impulse to disclaim connexion with the prisoner. Perhaps if he had had more time to reflect he would not have decided otherwise. If he had owned the charge, he would either have been ignominiously turned out, and have had to slink away in ignorance of his Master's fate, or more probably have been detained as an accomplice in his Master's projects; and though he had been prepared to fight

for Him, he saw no wisdom in uselessly suffering with Him. But feeling it unsafe to remain where he was, yet unwilling to go away altogether, he went out into what Mark calls the *προαύλιον*, and Matthew the *πυλῶν*, by which I understand the approach by which the hall was entered from the outside; and there he mingled with a group already standing there. But the maid, seeing him again, had no doubt of his identity, and called out to the men standing there, that this was one of them; and when he denied again, the men took notice of his Galilean accent, and were thus so convinced that the accusation must be true that it was only by confirming his denial with strong oaths that he obtained his release.

The incident was a humiliating one for Peter; but if it had not been for his previous braggart promises, was not so disgraceful as we are apt to think it. The majority of men would not have done better under a like trial. He failed to display a martyr's courage; but a martyr has usually had time to consider, and resolve beforehand on his conduct. But Peter had received an unexpected blow. A martyr's courage springs from his faith; but Peter's faith in his Master's superhuman power had been rudely shaken when he saw Him led away an unresisting captive. I fear we can only receive with doubt the tender touch recorded by St Luke that it was the look of Jesus which recalled him to a better mind. Peter was not present in the hall of audience; and when he sat with the servants was apparently not in sight of his Master. It may, no doubt, have been the case that it was as Jesus was being led away that He turned to give the look which touched Peter's conscience; but certainly, according to the other Evangelists, it was the crowing of the cock which brought to Peter's mind the estimate which his Master had put on the value of his professions, an estimate now proved to be so much more accurate than his own.

There is one point in which Mark differs from the

other three Evangelists : viz., that while they represent our Lord as saying *Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me*, Mark says, *Before the cock crow twice*. If, as I believe, the other Evangelists made use of the Gospel story as told by St Mark, they would not have been likely to deviate from it here ; and I have elsewhere¹ given reasons for thinking it quite possible that the discrepancy now under consideration might have originated in the error of an early transcriber. But indeed, though our English idiom obliges us to use the definite article, I doubt whether anything turns on the number of times any particular cock crew. I understand our Lord's prediction as meaning no more than that Peter should deny Him thrice before the hour of cockcrow, viz., that hour of early morning which was technically known as ἡ ἀλεκτοροφωνία.

THE REFERENCE TO PILATE

MARK xv. 1.

Καὶ εὐθὺς πρῶτ' συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ.

MATT. xxvii. 1, 2.

Πρῶτας δὲ γενομένης συμβούλιον ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν· καὶ δήσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγον καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ τῷ ἡγεμόνι.

LUKE xxiii. 1, 2.

Καὶ ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον. ἤρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες, Τοῦτον εὗραμεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ κωλύοντα φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι καὶ λέγοντα αὐτὸν χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι.

The relation of dependence of Matthew on Mark is nowhere more distinct than in this chapter. We have sections in which Mark is plainly copied, interpolated with sections derived from another, and, as we should judge, a later source. In the verses just cited, the verbal coincidences between Matthew and Mark are numerous ; of which it may suffice to mention how the double verb in δήσαντες . . . ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ

¹ *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the N.T.*, p. 123 sqq.

παρέδωκαν is reproduced in Matthew. But then follows, in Matt. xxvii. 3-10, the story of the remorse of Judas, which is not told by St Mark, and with which St Luke seemed to be unacquainted even when he wrote the Acts.¹ St Luke, on the other hand, appears to have in this chapter a quite independent source, and he shews plainly his perception that the grounds on which the Jewish rulers decided that Jesus ought to die were different from those on which they could seek His condemnation by Pilate. At their own tribunal the charge of blasphemy was the fatal one; but before Pilate the accusation was one of sedition and attempted revolution.

I suppose St Mark's language does not imply that another council was summoned different from that in which the High Priest had pronounced that Jesus deserved to die; but that, after this conclusion was come to, a consultation was held as to the manner in which punishment was to be inflicted, with the result of a decision that it must be through the authority of the Roman Governor.

THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE

MARK xv. 2-5.

MATT. xxvii. 11-14.

LUKE xxiii. 3-5.

I have already said that we are at no loss to conjecture means of information which the Evangelists might have had as to the proceedings before the Jewish Council, one member at least of which we know was friendly to Jesus. But when the boldest of their number returned in a state of intimidation and dejection from his attempt to penetrate the secrets of the High Priest's palace, it may be doubted whether many

¹ Dr Salmon's second draft of his notes ends here; all that follows is from the first draft.

of the disciples would have had courage to mingle with the crowd before Pilate's tribunal. Again I must fall back on Joseph as the most likely person to be able to obtain information as to the proceedings, and to communicate it to the disciples.

I think we need have no doubt as to the leading facts of the Evangelic tradition; as, for example, that Pilate shewed reluctance to send Jesus to execution, and was willing to release Him, not indeed as acquitted, but as the prisoner who according to usage was to be released in honour of the Passover feast. But I do not think that we can have entirely the same confidence in the report of the examination that took place. I say this, because there is one point in the report which presents great difficulty; namely, that when Pilate asked our Lord whether He was the King of the Jews, he received the answer *σὺ λέγεις*, which is generally understood to be a formula of assent. Having received such an answer, how could Pilate report to the Jewish accusers that he found no fault in Him? And if the accused person had pleaded guilty to the fatal charge, why should His enemies go on urging many accusations against Him to which Pilate vainly asked for a reply? I own I am not satisfied with the solution that *σὺ λέγεις* may be taken interrogatively. Certainly what is else related of this examination would lead us to suppose that our Lord made no answer at all to Pilate; and we are at some loss for an explanation of this silence. We can understand His offering no defence to the Jewish rulers, who had practically stopped their ears against anything He could say; but to Pilate He could with truth disown any claims at which Cæsar could take just umbrage. In fact, the Fourth Evangelist has put into the mouth of Jesus the defence which, if He did not make, a Christian would feel that He could have made, *My Kingdom is not of this world*. The same Evangelist makes the Jews tell Pilate what it might be supposed he did not

need to be reminded of, namely, that he would not be Cæsar's friend if he let a man go who claimed to be a rival monarch. I have not ventured to use St John's account as historical; for our Lord's holding so much discussion with the Governor (whether through an interpreter or not we are not told) is inconsistent with the impression the other Evangelists convey that He was silent before Pilate. But certainly, if the Evangelist John is not a historian on whose accuracy we can rely, he must have been, as other instances besides the present show, a man of great dramatic power, who had a clear perception of the language which could with propriety be put into the mouths of his characters.

If we reject the solution that our Lord was in point of fact not silent before Pilate; the only way that occurs to me of accounting for His silence is that, after the strain of the work of the previous day, of the sleepless night, and the brutal insults of His tormentors, His physical frame was incapable of conducting a discussion. And we could sufficiently account for Pilate's unwillingness to condemn, if he perceived that the man against whom so much accusation was brought was quite unable to say a word in His own defence. In this choice between Jesus and Barabbas, might he not feel that the more dangerous enemy to Cæsar was the man in vigorous health who had already taken part in an insurrection in which lives had been lost, and not the so-called prophet who seemed unable to speak, much less to act. And if he had no trust in the loyalty of the Jewish advisers, might he not have even suspected that they were willing to sacrifice one whom they regarded as useless, in order to save the life of one who would be really dangerous.

St Luke now proceeds (xxiii. 6-12) to tell that Pilate, on learning that Jesus was a Galilean, sent Him to Herod as one under his jurisdiction; that the chief priests and scribes repeated their accusations

before Herod ; that Herod, whom this Evangelist had already described (ix. 9) as having been for a long time desirous to see Jesus, was gratified by the compliment paid to him ; and that friendly relations between him and Pilate, which had been interrupted, were thus restored. Though this reference to Herod is not recorded by the other Evangelists, we are not warranted in concluding that it did not take place ; for we do not know what facilities the disciples of Jesus possessed for following His movements on that morning, or whether He might not have been sent to Herod without their knowledge. Moreover, the knowledge of what took place at Herod's court may have been communicated to the disciples by Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward, who had both previously contributed to His maintenance (Luke viii. 3), and also was one of the women who visited His sepulchre (Luke xxiv. 10).

JESUS OR BARABBAS

MARK xv. 6-11. MATT. xxvii. 15-18, 20. LUKE xxiii. 13-19.

Verse 17 in Luke is wanting in the oldest MSS., yet it seems necessary to the sense ; for why should the crowd cry, *Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas*, unless because it was understood that only one of the two was to be released. It seems to me, then, that whether verse 17 was written by St Luke or not, the Evangelist was acquainted with the older form of the story. If for any reason he had omitted to tell of this Passover custom, it would be natural for scribes or editors to supply an explanation which seemed necessary.

How did Pilate come to know that the priests had delivered Jesus *διὰ φθόρον*? I think the answer is that we are told that they went on accusing Him of many things, and no doubt the charge of blasphemy

held a chief place among these. Pilate, who saw that they gave no proof of the political offence, or that there was any evidence that He had stirred up a popular sedition, came to the conclusion that His religious offence and the rejection of their spiritual authority was the real accusation. And that Jesus should make no reply to the charge of blasphemy was in Pilate's mind a point in His favour.

THE SENTENCE OF PILATE

MARK xv. 12-15.

MATT. xxvii. 21-23, 26.

LUKE xxiii. 20-25.

I see nothing in St Luke's account which would lead me to think that in this section he used a different authority than Mark.

St Matthew follows Mark's Latin word *φραγελλώσας*; elsewhere he uses *μαστιγούν*.

The choice of Barabbas was no doubt instigated by the priests; but provincial and religious jealousies would have recommended the same choice to the people. Suppose a Dublin mob had the choice of obtaining a pardon for one of the Phoenix Park murderers or for a Belfast Orangeman who had got into a collision with the police, which would be chosen?

THE MOCKING BY THE SOLDIERS

MARK xv. 16-20.

MATT. xxvii. 27-31.

St Matthew's account seems to be but an expansion of St Mark's, save for one point in which he makes what seems a more than conjectural improvement.

Where St Mark says *they clothed him with purple*, St Matthew says, that *they threw round him* (no doubt He had been stripped for the scourging) *a scarlet cloak*. One of the soldier's cloaks would be the nearest imitation of royal purple they could easily make. But where did this take place? St Mark says they led Jesus *away within the court, which is the Prætorium*. One would have imagined this to mean the Governor's hall of audience, but this was exactly where Jesus had been. I am attracted by Weiss's conjecture that what is meant is that the guard which had the charge of the crucifixion took Him into the soldiers' quarters, a court with rooms round it, and that then all the soldiers came running out (or were called out) to join in the cruel sport. And to them, no doubt, a miserable Jew who pretended to royalty would seem a very fit subject for ridicule. St John has another explanation, though one not free from difficulties. According to him, the Jews would not go into the hall of audience; and it was outside that Jesus was exhibited to the multitude. Then we are no doubt here to conceive that the soldiers took Jesus back into the empty hall, which is what St John understands by the Prætorium (John xviii. 28).

St Luke does not give the account of mocking in this place, but he represents a quite similar scene to have been enacted by the soldiers of Herod (Luke xxiii. 11).

THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE
CRUCIFIXION

MARK xv. 21-23.

Καὶ ἀγαρεῖουσιν παρά-
γοντά τινα Σίμωνα Κυρη-
ναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ,
τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ
Ρούφου, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυ-
ρὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ φέρουσιν
αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθὰν
τόπον, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμη-
νεύμενος Κρανίου Τόπος.
καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ἔσμυρ-
νισμένον οἶνον, ὃς δὲ οὐκ
ἔλαβεν.

MATT. xxvii. 32-34.

Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον
ἄνθρωπον Κυρηναῖον ὀνό-
ματι Σίμωνα· τοῦτον ἡγ-
γάρευσαν ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν
σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐλ-
θόντες εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον
Γολγοθὰ, ὃ ἐστὶν Κρανίου
Τόπος λεγόμενος, ἔδωκαν
αὐτῷ πιεῖν οἶνον μετὰ
χολῆς μεμιγμένον· καὶ
γευσάμενος οὐκ ἠθέλησεν
πιεῖν.

LUKE xxiii. 26.

Καὶ ὡς ἀπήγαγον αὐτόν,
ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σίμωνα τινα
Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ'
ἀγροῦ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν
σταυρὸν φέρειν ὀπισθεν
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

It is evident, even if no mention had been made of Alexander, that this Simon either was a disciple of Christ, or that he afterwards became a member of the Christian community. How else should they know the name of the man pressed into this unpleasant service, and that he was a native of Cyrene?

Note St Mark's care about his imperfect tenses. He could not say ἔδωκαν, as St Matthew does, about the offer of the medicated wine. The offer not having been accepted, St Mark says ἐδίδουν.

For ἐσμυρνισμένον St Matthew substitutes μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον. I cannot but think that this is a remembrance of prophecy, Ps. lxix. 21, καὶ ἔδωκαν εἰς τὸ βρῶμά μου χολήν, καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος. St John, xix. 28, tells the story so as to make the fulfilment of the prophecy more marked.

THE CRUCIFIXION

MARK xv. 24-32.

Καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρῃ. ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη, Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ. Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο ληστές, ἓνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἓνα ἐξ ἐωνύμων αὐτοῦ. Καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινούντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, Οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν [ἐν] τρισὶν ἡμέραις, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων ἔλεγον, "Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι· ὁ χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν, καὶ πιστεύσωμεν. καὶ οἱ συνσταυρωθέντες σὺν αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν.

MATT. xxvii. 35-44.

Σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν διμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλῆρον, καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ. καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην, ΟΥΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ. Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἐωνύμων. Οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινούντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, "Ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν, σῶσον σεαυτόν· εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κατάβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. ὁμοίως [καὶ] οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἔλεγον, "Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι· βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐστίν, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πιστεύσομεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. πέποιθεν ἐν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν· εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λησταὶ οἱ συνσταυρωθέντες σὺν αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν.

LUKE xxiii. 32-43.

"Ἦγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακούργοι δύο σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι. Καὶ ὅτε ἦλθαν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον, ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς κακούργους, ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν ὃν δὲ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. [ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν, Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.] Διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλῆρον. καὶ ἰσθήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες λέγοντες, "Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σῶσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἐκλεκτός. ἐνέπαιζαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται προσερχόμενοι, ὕψος προσφέροντες αὐτῷ καὶ λέγοντες, Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ, Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ ΟΥΤΟΣ. Εἷς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτόν, Οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς; σῶσον σεαυτόν καὶ ἡμᾶς. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη, Οὐδὲ φοβῆσθαι τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ; καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως, ἀξία γὰρ ὦν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν· οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἐπράξεν. καὶ ἔλεγεν, Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἀμήν σοι λέγω, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.

Luke xxiii. 34.—There is no saying of our Lord's which we should more regret to lose than this one, yet it is imperfectly attested. It is not found in B

nor in a few of the oldest Latin MSS. On the other hand, the Sinaitic is not here allied with the Vatican MS.; and the words are attested by Irenæus and Origen and the Clementine Homilies. I do not know whether the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, A.D. 177, is not to be added to the evidence against the verse. At least I think that Stephen *the perfect martyr* would not have been cited as an example of a martyr praying for his murderers, if the writer had known that therein Stephen was only following an example set by our Lord Himself. I believe the best explanation is to accept the theory of a double edition of St Luke's Gospel, and to reckon this as one of the most valuable of the additions made by St Luke to the later form of his work. I know of only one alternative solution that deserves consideration. Hegesippus (Euseb. *H.E.*, ii. 23), in relating the death of James the Just, reports that martyr as making the dying prayer, παρακαλῶ, κύριε θεὲ πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν; it might be imagined that so beautiful a prayer, and so worthy of our Lord Himself, was transferred by an early scribe to Luke's narrative. But it is quite as likely that Hegesippus copied Luke. The address πάτερ is more appropriate to our Lord than to James, and comes in awkwardly as used by Hegesippus. Moreover, I think the recognition of the verse by Irenæus and Origen is too early to be consistent with ascribing the origin to Hegesippus.

St Mark states that it was the third hour when they crucified Him, that is to say, at nine in the morning. I do not think so early an hour is inconsistent with the statement in Luke that our Lord was sent to Herod. The Jewish Council was held before sunrise (for Peter was recognised only by the light of the fire). Our Lord, then, might have been sent to Pilate soon after six o'clock; and, as Herod was in Jerusalem, the trial before him and the second hearing before Pilate might all have taken place in the space of three hours. But I own the story would read more

smoothly if we leave out the visit to Herod which the other authorities do not mention.

THE MIRACULOUS DARKNESS

MARK xv. 33.

Καὶ γενομένης ὥρας
ἑκτῆς σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ'
ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας
ἐνάτης.

MATT. xxvii. 45.

Ἀπὸ δὲ ἑκτῆς ὥρας
σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν
τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης.

LUKE xxiii. 44, 45a.

Καὶ ἦν ἡδὴ ὥσεί ὥρα
ἑκτη καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο
ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας
ἐνάτης τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλεί-
ποντος.

The language of Luke has caused some embarrassment to commentators, but I cannot doubt that τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος is the original reading ; not only because it is attested by the better MSS., but also because I think it quite possible that St Luke might have so expressed himself, but not possible that any scribe would have substituted these words if St Luke had written ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος. The words literally mean no more than “the sun’s light failing,” but there is no doubt that the phrase is that ordinarily used to denote an eclipse of the sun. But we cannot suppose that St Luke was ignorant that the Passover feast was held at the full moon ; and though I do not think it necessary to maintain that St Luke was skilled in natural philosophy, it is not likely that he was ignorant of a thing so generally known as that an eclipse of the sun does not take place at full moon. So I consider that St Luke has not exhibited ignorance, but only has been guilty of an awkwardness of expression. He wished to make it plain that this darkness at mid-day did not arise from clouds or fog, but from a real failure of the sun’s light, and we may well believe that he recognised in it a fulfilment of Joel’s prophecy which he has quoted elsewhere (Acts ii. 20), ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφίσεται εἰς σκότος. In other words, it is plainly an eclipse that all the Evangelists describe, only not a natural one, but a miraculous one. It is then quite conceivable that when the ambiguity of the phrase suggested to some that St Luke was relating a

natural, and not a supernatural, occurrence, and they made the objection that an eclipse could not take place at that time, then, either in the public reading of the Gospel or in its transcription, the phrase was changed for one not open to cavil.

THE COMPLAINT OF FORSAKENNESS

MARK xv. 34-36.

Καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐβόη-
σεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγά-
λῃ, Ἐλωί, ἐλωί, λαμὰ
σα βαχθανεῖ; ὃ ἐστὶν
μεθερμηνεόμενον, Ὁ θεὸς
μου [ὁ θεὸς μου], εἰς τί
ἐγκατέλιπές με; καὶ τινες
τῶν παρεστηκότων ἀκού-
σαντες ἔλεγον, Ἴδε Ἡλε-
αν φωνεῖ. δρᾶμῶν δέ τις
γεμίσας σπόγγον ὕδρου
περιθεὶς καλὰ μὴ ἐπότιζεν
αὐτόν, λέγων, Ἄφετε,
ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλείας
καθελεῖν αὐτόν.

MATT. xxvii. 46-49.

Περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν
ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ
μεγάλῃ λέγων, Ἐλωί,
ἐλωί, λεμὰ σαβαχθανεῖ;
τοῦτ' ἔστιν, Θεέ μου, θεέ
μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέ-
λιπες; τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἐκεῖ
ἐστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλε-
γον ὅτι, Ἡλείαν φωνεῖ
οὗτος. καὶ εὐθέως δρα-
μῶν εἰς ἕξ αὐτῶν καὶ
λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας
τε ὕδρου καὶ περιθεὶς κα-
λὰ μὴ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν. οἱ
δὲ λοιποὶ εἶπαν, Ἄφες
ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλείας
σώσων αὐτόν.

LUKE xxiii. 44b, 46a.

Σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην
τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης.
. . . καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ
μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν,
κ.τ.λ. . . .

It has become customary to talk of our Lord's Seven Words on the cross. But the seven are made out by combining different accounts. What is actually the case is that Matthew and Mark, who give practically identical accounts, only tell of one, that which has just been quoted. This has not been copied by the later Evangelists; and truly it is not wonderful that Christians should be unwilling to record that the Master had died with a confession of failure in His mouth. St Luke, on the other hand, tells the story of the penitent robber, which seems to have been unknown to the previous Evangelists, who represent our Lord as taunted by both His companions in suffering. St Mark records that our Lord just before dying uttered another great cry, but does not report any words. St Luke gives them, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*, all the words but the first being taken from Ps. xxxi. 5.

The last editor of St Luke's Gospel, whether St Luke himself or not, has added the noble saying on which we have already commented. St John does not repeat any of these four sayings, which I think can only be accounted for on the supposition that His Gospel was intended to be supplemental ; but he adds three of his own, viz., our Lord's words to His mother and to John ; His complaint of thirst, made in order to fulfil Ps. lxix. ; and the final *It is finished*. Probably it was only what was said in a loud voice that could be heard where the spectators were. All this gives great credibility to the account of St Mark, who only reports what might be heard from some little distance.

The imperfect ἐλεγον is here used in accordance with St Mark's practice, when several persons are represented as speaking who cannot be imagined to speak quite simultaneously. But I cannot understand the imperfect in ἐπ'ὅτιξεν, except that it was St Mark's way.

St Matthew's account is apparently more probable than St Mark's. St Matthew represents one as performing the act of mercy, the others as using the jeering words, *Wait till we see if Elijah will take him down*. St Mark puts these words into the mouth of the compassionate speaker himself, from which Weiss concludes that he must have uttered the words seriously, and in the idea that the intervention of Elijah was possible. Yet I can understand the case of a man's obeying a natural instinct of compassion, yet somewhat mocking at himself for doing so, and justifying himself to his companions by saying, We must give time for Elijah to come to save Him. He accepts their supposition that they may not hinder him.

One who can remember the crowds that used to come to witness the spectacle of a man being hanged does not wonder at a multitude coming to witness a crucifixion in which they had no personal interest. But it would seem that the merciful assuagement of the thirst of the sufferers was not unusual ; else why should a sponge and a reed be there? The Fourth

Evangelist dispenses with the reed; he makes the sponge be put on one of the soldiers' spears, ὑσσῶν, which Field, by a certain conjecture, has substituted for ὑσσώπω¹ in John xix. 29. The Gospel of Peter, apparently written by one who had never seen a crucifixion, has not realised the distance of the sufferer from the ground, and dispenses with either reed or spear.

THE DEATH

MARK xv. 37-39.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφελὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν. Καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν, Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.

MATT. xxvii. 50, 51a.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. Καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη [ἀπ'] ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω εἰς δύο.

THE EARTHQUAKE
AND THE OPENING
OF THE TOMBS.

Ver. 54.

Ὁ δὲ ἐκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ τηρόντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμόν καὶ τὰ γινόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα, λέγοντες, Ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος.

LUKE xxiii. 45b-47.

Ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον. καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖρας σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμα μου· τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἐκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων, Ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν.

The rending of the veil of the Temple is recorded by all three Evangelists, and by St Matthew and St Mark in almost identical words. But St Matthew relates this as one of several phenomena that occurred at the same time. I own I had imagined that these were a later addition to the original story preserved by St Mark; but I now feel doubts whether the reverse may not be the case, and whether we have not in Matthew an earlier form of the tale which St Mark simplified by leaving out things which were felt not to be credible. Such I take to be the raising of the bodies

¹ "ὑσσός was the Greek equivalent for the Roman *pilum*." *Notes on the Trans. of the N. T.*

of the saints and their appearing in the city after our Lord's own resurrection. If, as the story seems to tell, they rose immediately on our Lord's death, they must have risen before Him, and He would not be *the first fruits of them that sleep*. If they were seen after His resurrection, what became of them afterwards? And who can we imagine to be the saints who rose? Were they disciples of our Lord's? It is hard to believe in a miracle that leads to nothing. And yet the rending of the veil of the Temple is more easily understood if supposed to happen in conjunction with the earthquake and the other phenomena, than as an isolated occurrence. Moreover, according to St Matthew's account, the centurion's exclamation *Truly this was the Son of God*, was drawn from him, when he *saw the earthquake and the things that were done*, which made him *fear greatly*. As St Mark tells the story, the exclamation was only elicited by observing the manner in which Jesus died. No doubt death on the cross must usually have taken place from exhaustion; and to die immediately after having made a great shout must have been unusual; yet it seems scarcely enough to have produced a sudden impression of the sufferer's innocence; much less that He really deserved the title He was said to have claimed for Himself—Son of God.

But now we come to an important factor in the determination of the date of our present Gospel of St Matthew. According to some texts of Matthew, we find after verse 49, ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἐνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα. This reminds us of the story told by St John, xix. 34, only that in this latter version of the story the lance thrust was made after the Saviour's death, in order to make sure that death had actually taken place; but in the version ascribed to St Matthew, while one of those who heard the agonising cry, *Eli, Eli*, mercifully gave the sufferer drink, another, resolved that the criminal should not escape, anticipated the intervention of Elijah with a lance thrust. And if we accept this reading, this

stroke must have been the immediate cause of Christ's death.

If this insertion is spurious, it must have been made after the publication of the Gospel of St John, who not only here, but in his first Epistle, lays much stress on this incident. And if it is no part of the original Hebrew Matthew, but a genuine part of the Greek Matthew, as Hort evidently considered it, then it would follow that the Greek Matthew is later than the Fourth Gospel. The other theory must be that it was part of the original Matthew which the Fourth Evangelist wove into his narrative with some variation. Yet I confess that, though I find in the Fourth Gospel many traces of acquaintance with the Second and Third Gospels, I find elsewhere no trace of acquaintance with any part of the First, save those which St Mark had already employed. We should certainly have no scruple in rejecting this insertion if it were not that it is attested by those MSS. which in other cases we have reason to regard as containing the oldest text. Yet there is a great lack of the confirmatory testimony which is to be found in other cases. The Patristic testimony in favour of the insertion is only Cyril of Alexandria and, what we should less expect, Chrysostom. The old Latin MSS., which have preserved for us a very ancient type of text, give no adherence here. The only ancient Western testimony is D, a MS. which contains many things the right of which to a place in the true text cannot be admitted. Origen appears to be unacquainted with the story; but it is only fair to add that the passage of Celsus to which Origen is replying seems to imply the use of a MS. which contained the passage. On the whole, the evidence in favour of the insertion is so limited that I think that if the passage had ever been in the genuine text of the First Gospel it could never have been eliminated, so as to leave so little trace of its existence. Hort seems to have believed in the right of this verse to a place in what he ambiguously calls "the extant

form" of Matthew. My own hesitation in rejecting this verse as an interpolation is that I see no reason why any one who had read St John's Gospel should have transposed the incident from after death to before it. But I can understand that St John, if he had read the story in the latter form, and had known such an objection as Celsus had made to the representation of ichor flowing from our Lord's side when wounded, might have made a useful correction. On the whole, however, I believe that the verse originated in the mistake of an oral narrator of our Lord's history, who, remembering the story as told by St John, had severed the incident from its true connexion.

THE WOMEN AT THE CROSS

MARK xv. 40, 41.

Ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, ἐν αἷς καὶ Μαριάμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήτος μήτηρ καὶ Σαλώμη, αἱ ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

MATT. xxvii. 55, 56.

Ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, αἷτινες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ· ἐν αἷς ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ μήτηρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου.

LUKE xxiii. 48, 49.

Καὶ πάντες οἱ συνπαρεγόμενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωρήσαντες τὰ γενόμενα, τύπτοντες τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον. ἰστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὁρῶσαι ταῦτα.

Here there is nothing in Matthew that may not have been taken from Mark. We must not press the ἀπὸ μακρόθεν so as to regard it impossible that they could hear what our Lord said, or even converse with Him. Their position is contrasted with that of the centurion, whose official duty placed him opposite to the cross and close at hand. Mere spectators no doubt had to stand at a somewhat greater distance. No doubt, pictorial representations which shew some women actually embracing the cross are not trustworthy.

St Mark's imperfect διηκόνουν is right, as he is speaking of continuous ministrations in Galilee. St

Matthew uses the aorist, as if it was only on the journey up that they ministered. St Luke (viii. 3) names the women who accompanied our Lord in His missionary tours, and who had then supplied Him with the necessary travelling expenses; and he intimates that they had been moved with gratitude for cures performed on them. He names, xxiv. 10, two of the same women as being spectators of the crucifixion, Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward. Both he and St Mark say that there were other women too; so that neither does St Mark's enumeration exclude Joanna, whom he does not mention, neither does St Luke's exclude Salome. That some of these women survived our Lord for some time is not unlikely; and I cannot help thinking that it was from one of them that St Luke derived some materials for his history. It was probably thus that he learnt the saying *Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, etc.*, addressed by our Lord to the women who followed the melancholy procession to Calvary; and the trait which he alone records, how they came back smiting their breasts. Perhaps it was also from the same source that he derived the incident recorded in chapter xi. 27, how a woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice saying *Blessed is the womb that bore thee*. They were, then, in the train when our Lord and His disciples made their last journey to Jerusalem.

THE BURIAL

MARK xv. 42-47. MATT. xxvii. 57-61. LUKE xxiii. 50-56.

We see now what was meant by *ὥψια*, viz., between three and six o'clock. We have read that it was after three when our Lord died. It must have been before six, or the work of taking down the body and of buying the *σινδών* could not have been done.

Joseph was a man in good position, apparently a member of the Sanhedrim. It would not seem that he was actually a believer in the Messiahship of Jesus, but he sympathised with His expectation of the coming Kingdom. He was therefore one whose request Pilate might be likely to grant; yet it required some courage to show sympathy with one who had just been put to death on a charge of treason and sedition; and might have exposed him to unpleasant questions. Pilate, however, made no difficulty, except that he was surprised to hear that the death of Jesus had come sooner than was usual in crucifixion. There would have been no need for the question if St John's story was true that, if His death had not come naturally, it would have been accelerated.

Mark xv. 44.—There is an overwhelming weight of testimony in favour of the reading *πάλαι ἀπέθανεν*; so that in my opinion B's dissent may be set aside. The reading *πάλαι* might have puzzled scribes; but the question seems to be whether He had been long dead. If the report was that He had only just breathed His last there would be a risk of being deceived, by a pretended report of death into giving over a living criminal to his friends.

Verse 45.—I understand *ἐδωρίσατο* to mean that Pilate granted the request without requiring any money payment.

According to Mark, Joseph had brought nothing but the *σινδών*, and wrapped Jesus in it. There probably did not seem to be time for the purchase of spice. St John however tells that Nicodemus contributed a large quantity, when bought we are not told. The women do not seem to be aware of it, for they went off to buy spices to be used on Sunday morning.

The rest of the crowd had dispersed on the death of Jesus; but the two Marys remained to see what was done with the body, and they marked the place where it was laid. As to the question whether the whole of Friday would not have been observed sabbatically

if the Passover had been eaten the evening before, so that Friday was the first day of the Passover Week, I can only say that St Mark knew more of the Jewish customs of the time than I do. He says very distinctly that our Lord ate the Passover on the Thursday evening. On Friday evening they *prepared the spices* (Luke xxiii. 56), whether that means buying them or not; and they rested only on the Saturday. Matthew and Mark do not say that the women had time to do anything on Friday evening but mark the spot; and St Mark expressly says that they did not buy the spices till Sunday morning; St John deals with other parts of the history in so arbitrary a way that I do not think it necessary to accept his guidance.

THE NEWS OF THE RESURRECTION

MARK xvi. 1-8.

MATT. xxviii. 1-10.

LUKE xxiv. 1-11.

Weiss considers that the mention of the names of the women so soon again indicates that chapter xv. closes St Mark's Gospel, as originally planned, and that chapter xvi. begins a new little work. I should feel no difficulty in looking on this as a new section; for my theory being that the Gospel of St Mark contains different recitations of the Petrine traditions delivered in the Christian assemblies, I should be not ill pleased if we were able to divide the Gospel into sections, each containing the lesson for the day. But I find no difficulty here. St Mark had told of the presence of women as spectators of the crucifixion, of whom he names the two Marys and Salome. Only the two Marys remained behind when the others departed, their desire being to ascertain what would be done with the body. But he begins the 16th chapter by telling that Salome accompanied the others now in the morning visit to the sepulchre.

Who shall roll us away the stone?—A striking example of the way in which people often distress themselves by anticipation of difficulties which in point of fact never arise. But the fact that St Mark represents the weight of the stone as the only obstacle to their visit that the women anticipated is evidence that St Mark was ignorant that the tomb was watched by a guard of soldiers, as St Matthew states. The most formidable difficulty in the way of their entrance would be the necessity of obtaining the permission of the soldiers for their visit. And St Matthew seems to have perceived this, and gets over the difficulty by omitting to let his readers suppose that the women had any desire to enter the sepulchre at all. He does not say a word about their bringing spices to anoint the body. According to him, their only object was to see the place. St Mark's account is quite intelligible, that on Friday night they were careful to mark the place to which they desired to come as soon as the Sabbath was over; but St Matthew does not assign any adequate object for the visit.

There is a very important difference between the story as told by St Mark and St Luke, and by St Matthew. Mark and Luke tell of a vision of angels seen by the women, but neither tells that our Lord Himself appeared to them. The appearance however to Mary Magdalene is told in the appendix to Mark and also by St John; and it appears to me that in all probability St John is the earlier witness, though it is no doubt conceivable that John may but give a fuller account of what had been more briefly stated in an earlier tradition. But it is remarkable that St Matthew also makes Jesus appear to the women, after they have seen the angelic vision, and before they report to the disciples. I have doubted whether St Matthew borrowed from John or *vice versâ*; but considering that St Matthew makes no separate mention of Mary Magdalene, but only tells of an appearance to the women, it seems to me best to adhere to the common opinion that St Matthew

was the earlier, and to regard St John as having skilfully used the hint which Matthew furnished. There is another point of coincidence between the two accounts, viz., that both St Matthew and St John give the message in the form, *Go, tell my brethren.*

It would really seem from St Matthew's narrative that the women found the guard at watch, though not in a condition to interfere with them. It seems to have been the same angel who descended and rolled away the stone and sat upon it, at whose appearance the keepers became as dead men, who addressed the women when they came with *μὴ φοβείσθε ὑμεῖς*, where the emphatic position of the *ὑμεῖς* conveys the idea that others were present who had some reason to be afraid.

St Luke appears to have taken liberties with the earlier tradition. Both St Mark and St Matthew agree that the message to the disciples was to direct them to go to Galilee, and that there they should see Him. St Luke, who in the rest of the story varies little from Mark, here makes the angels' mention of Galilee to be *Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee.* St Luke himself tells of no appearance in Galilee. St John adds one in the appendix to his Gospel.

According to St Mark's narrative, it would seem to be implied that the women never delivered the message to the Apostles. The appendix tells that they did deliver it, and were not believed, though if St Matthew's account be true that they actually grasped His feet, doubt would seem unreasonable.

The difference of language between Mark and his appendix will be found in Weiss. I totally dissent from Westcott and Hort's opinion that the appendix is a separate document joined on, and not intended as a completion to the Gospel. I believe it is the addition made, most probably in the Roman Church, to complete the manifest want of a true conclusion. Some have imagined that there was a different conclusion, and have hoped to recover it from the Gospel of Peter,

or some other early document. I do not believe it possible now to recover it. When this appendix was written no other conclusion to the Gospel was known. And the appendix is so early as to have been recognised by Irenæus. Therefore I conclude that if St Mark ever put a different conclusion to his Gospel it was lost so early as to be now irrecoverable.

INDEX OF PERSONS AND SUBJECTS

- ABBOTT, Dr Edwin A., 15, 18, 19, 312, 313, 320
 Alford, Dean, 18
 Antioch, church of; source of St Luke's knowledge of the Gospel history, 26, 27, 38, 400
 Antiochian critics; their principles, 400-403
 Apostle; as a name for the Twelve, 186, 189, 191, 192, 309
 Authority; meaning of *He taught as having authority*, 90

 BACON, Lord, 21
 Baptism; the difference between the baptism of John and Christian baptism, 46
 Baur, 2, 3
 Bentley, 323
 Bethsaida, 80, 311, 326, 341, 342, 390, 394
 Butler, Archer, 265

 CELSUS, 408, 409, 524, 525
 Cheyne, Professor, 67
 Children; known to Jesus, 379, 395, 396
 Chorazin; scene of Jesus' ministry before the calling of Peter, 80, 297, 311
 Christ; as a proper name, 36, 229, 383, 384
 Chrysostom, St John, 524
 Church reading of the Gospels; a source of variation between the Synoptics, 56, 57, 83, 114, 217, 219, 464, 476
 —, a source of various readings, 228, 240, 520
 Church teaching; as interpreting and modifying Sayings of Jesus, 114, 115, 122, 127, 131, 133, 391, 415
Clementine Homilies, 39, 196, 402, 518
 Clement of Alexandria, St, 166, 410, 414

 Commandments; order of the, 411
 Cross; meaning of *bearing the cross*, 359, 360
 Cyprian, St, 143; Pseudo-Cyprian, 46, 410
 Cyril of Alexandria, St, 524
 — of Jerusalem, St, 39

 DALMANUTHA, 343, 346
 Demoniacal possession, 60, 204, 205, 225, 275, 276, 370, 374
Didache, 143, 172
 Divorce, 128-131, 390-394
 Döllinger, von, 129
 Doublets, 86, 118, 125, 128, 185, 208, 212, 216, 217, 257, 260, 309, 310, 339, 341, 359, 386, 405, 423, 455, 459, 466, 467, 468, 470

 EPIPHANIUS, St, 35, 269
 Eusebius, 27, 199

 FASTING; Pharisaic fasts, 172
 —; *Prayer and fasting*, 374 *sqq.*
 Field, 134, 522

 GALEN, 102
 Geyer, P., 28
 Glaucias, 28
 Gore, Bishop, 128
 Gospel, The; oral recitation of, 27, 57, 74, 111, 281, 282, 404. *See* Luke. *See* Church Reading
 —, The; the term as used in the N.T., 36, 37, 38, 82, 83, 245, 360, 416
 —, The Primitive; evidence that it was in the Aramaic language, 28, 45, 50, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 61, 124, 125, 148, 169, 175, 208, 220, 226, 305, 335, 370, 397, 428, 455, 479
 —, The Primitive; identical with the Aramaic Matthew, 244, 360, 404, 405, 430, 437
 —, The Primitive; its relative date, 472, 474

Gospel, The Primitive Aramaic; translated into Greek by St Mark, 398, 415, 451, 478
 —, the Primitive Aramaic; evidence of a Greek translation earlier than Luke or the Greek Matthew, 29, 51, 66, 140, 141, 166, 208, 223, 232, 238, 244, 326, 335, 396, 398, 416, 451, 452, 468, 475, 478, 479
 —, the Ebionite, 46, 60
 Gospels; chronological sequence of, 405
 Gregory Nazianzen, St, 176, 177

HARRIS, J. Rendel, 155
Hebrews, Gospel according to the, 46, 55, 57, 60, 127, 402
 Hegesippus, 518
 Heracleon, 165, 166, 198
 Herodians, 182-184, 449
 Hort, F. J. A., 34, 35, 83, 108, 176, 209, 230, 468, 524, 530
 Howard, 504
 Huxley, 278

IGNATIUS, St, 55, 409
 Inspiration of the Gospels; remarks on its nature and degree, 4, 5, 6, 9, 15-18, 200, 202, 339, 340, 362, 482
 Irenæus, St, 35, 36, 142, 401, 497, 518, 531

JAMES (the Epistle); the writer's acquaintance with the Sermon on the Mount, 112, 113, 137, 144
 Jerome, St, 46, 176, 177, 239, 297, 485
 Jesus; His ministry before the call of Peter, 241. *See* Chorazin
 —; how He could be tempted, 63, 68
 —; His Human Mind, 254
 —; the extent of His knowledge as Man, 276, 476
 —; how His Human Soul awoke to a knowledge of His power, 344
 —; *the carpenter or the carpenter's son*, 288, 407
 —; *the son of Mary*, 288, 289
 —; His brethren, 289
 —; the name of Jesus used in exorcisms, 380
 —; had He a home of His own? 101, 161, 162, 167
 John the Baptist; his baptism of Jesus *the beginning of the Gospel*, 38
 —; His more ancient name, *the Baptizer*, 303, 308

John the Baptist; differently regarded by Jews and by Gentiles, 226, 236, 237, 368
 —; the significance of his testimony, 39, 441
 John (the Gospel); a theory as to its authorship, 436, 483, 486
 —; its relative date, 406, 483, 524
 —; estimation of its historical value, 290, 320 *note*, 322, 371, 429, 436, 483, 512, 528
 —; instances of statements in the Fourth Gospel which are credible or probable, 39, 75, 76, 80, 84, 237, 240, 290, 313, 322, 341, 346, 354, 435, 486, 489, 490, 498, 505, 511, 515
 —; discrepancies between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, 56, 317, 318, 406 *note*, 431-437, 490, 512, 527
 —; relation to the First Gospel, 319, 320, 406 *note*, 524, 525, 529, 530
 —; the writer's acquaintance with the Second Gospel, 204, 236, 316, 406 *note*, 485
 —; the writer's acquaintance with the Second and Third Gospels, 53, 84, 290, 405, 427, 484, 524
 Jonah, the sign of, 217 *sqq.*
 Josephus, 101
 Justin Martyr, St, 52, 57, 61, 401, 407, 408, 410, 497

LEBBÆUS, 197-199
 Little ones; who are meant by *these little ones*, 387, 388
Logia, 29, 70. *See also* Sayings of Jesus.
 Longinus, 5
 Luke, St; oral recitation a source of his knowledge of the Gospel history, 50, 67, 92, 121, 145, 211, 240, 244, 464, 494. *See* Antioch
 —; failure of memory a cause of his variations, 67, 123, 124, 132, 139, 145, 222, 283, 385
 —; his indebtedness to the women who accompanied our Lord, 526
 —; his teaching on the Holy Spirit, 46, 211, 212, 298, 299
 —; evidence of an Aramaic source (not Matthew) used by him, 455
 Luke (the Gospel); the nature of the order observed in the narrative, 73, 74, 78, 146, 156, 211, 273, 282, 287, 302, 311. *See also* Sayings of Jesus

Luke; relative date, 258, 284, 364, 421
 —; inferences from the Preface, 20, 24, 25, 123, 246
 —; relation to Matthew, 42, 43, 57, 457
 —; relation to Mark, 53, 71, 88, 118, 147, 211, 244, 316, 328, 333, 339, 377, 378
 —; two editions of it, 173, 497, 518, 521
 —; alleged Ebionite tendencies in it, 113-115, 412
 —; Pauline influence on it, 411, 491, 493
 —; St Paul's indebtedness to it, 296, 332
 —; the text — witness from Matthew, 468; witness from Mark, 177, 271
 —; its witness to the text of Mark, 94, 99, 192, 304, 425
 —; instances in which Luke is closer to the original than Matthew or Mark, 116, 415
 —; instances in which Luke varies materially from Mark, 151, 173, 181

MARK, St; his use of the imperfect tense, 48, 105, 253, 258, 315, 337, 400, 433, 437, 446, 451, 457, 495, 516, 521, 525
 —; his use of *ἡρξάτο* with an infinitive, followed by the imperfect, 294, 376, 421, 433, 434, 442, 464
 —; his use of the substantive verb with a participle, 47, 89, 172, 474, 486
 —; his use of participles, 305
 Mark (the Gospel); probably written in Rome, 53, 394
 —; embodies the Petrine tradition, 21-23, 28, 31, 62, 71, 72, 75, 77, 79, 100, 126, 197, 321, 349, 365, 368, 389, 429, 430, 463, 469, 489, 499, 528
 —; use of Q by the writer, 41, 58, 71
 —; evidence of a source, or sources, of the Second Gospel other than St Peter or Q, 341, 347, 382, 469
 —; Pauline influence on, 37, 380, 384, 416, 501
 —; internal evidence of relative date, 292, 306, 309, 363, 364, 469
 —; historical value of, 30, 31, 71, 85, 158, 159, 190, 202, 287, 327, 337, 344, 378

Mark; other instances of the credibility of Mark's order of narration, 211, 301, 302, 331, 349
 —; instances in which the Second Gospel is closer to the original than are the others, 130, 391, 398, 399, 401, 407, 445, 454, 470
 —; in what sense the Second Gospel is an abridgment, 155, 236, 250, 351, 417, 443, 459, 480
 —; the text — witness from Matthew, 305, 306, 373; witness from Luke, 94, 99, 192, 304, 425
 —; witness of Mark to the text of Luke, 177, 271
 —; the appendix to the Gospel, 343, 494, 529-531
 Mary Magdalene; possibly a relapsed demoniac
 Matthew (the Gospel); originally in the Aramaic language, 27, 28, 31, 61, 189, 244, 351, 371, 403, 410, 416, 424, 425, 446. *See* Gospel, the Primitive
 —; a Greek translation, or edition, of the original Aramaic Matthew, 70, 189, 264, 351, 371, 389, 398, 399, 403, 405, 410, 420, 424, 428, 446, 524
 —; a theory as to its composition, 71, 126, 403, 405
 —; the Gospel of the Palestinian churches, 321, 351
 —; relative date of the Greek Gospel, as we have it now, 55, 90, 188, 303, 406-410, 420, 426, 433, 455, 462, 465, 472, 523, 524
 —; relation to Mark, 23, 71, 77, 85, 86, 109, 403, 466, 472, 500
 —; relation to Luke, 42, 43
 —; relation to John. *See* John (the Gospel)
 —; employment of a source other than Q or Mark, 196, 335, 349, 360, 419, 451, 454, 488, 522
 —; instances in which Matthew is closer to the original than are the others, 43, 47, 49, 52, 53, 57, 60, 67, 68, 69, 122, 123, 156, 173, 197, 234, 235, 268, 269, 274, 291, 392, 468, 471, 479, 501
 —; witness to the text of Mark, 305, 306, 373
 —; witness to the text of Luke, 468
 —; order of narration, 281, 282, 301, 302. *See also* Sayings of Jesus
 —; prominence of Peter in Matthew, 321, 329, 349

536 INDEX OF PERSONS AND SUBJECTS

- Meyer, 176, 177
Milton, 64
Miracles; remarks on the miraculous element in the Gospels, 6, 7, 8, 102, 275, 278, 286, 322 *sqq.*, 350
- NAPIER, *History of Peninsular War*, 17
- ORIGEN, 60, 127, 198, 269, 270, 271, 277, 334, 399, 402, 408, 409, 425, 446, 518, 524
- PALEY, Archdeacon, 120
Papias, 21, 27, 28, 29, 31, 70
Patriarchs, the Twelve. See Testaments
Pauli Prædicatio, 46
Paulus, 322, 323
Peter, Gospel of, 522, 530
Philo, 411
Philumena, St, 9
Pliny, 270
Polybius, 19
Prophetical citations from O.T., 82, 170, 218, 264, 427, 488, 516
- ROBINSON, J. Armitage, 126
Rushbrooke, 19
- SAYINGS of Jesus, 27, 29, 30, 70, 111, 112, 115, 233, 234, 250
—; Matthew's arrangement of the Sayings, 122, 157, 252, 443, 457, 458
—; Luke's arrangement of the Sayings, 457, 479
Schleiermacher, 29, 70
Schmiedel, 312, 320
Seventy, The, 200-202, 294, 309
- Sign; the *Sign of the Son of Man*, 219, 462
—; a *sign* and a *sign from heaven*, 216-219, 344, 345
Sinkler, R., 58
Sinners; meaning of the term, 168, 170
Smith, Goldwin, 8
Strauss, 322, 323
Swete, H. B., 101
Sylvia Peregrinatio, 28
- TEACHING of the twelve Apostles. See Didache
Tertullian, 411
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 58
Textual criticism; how affected by the Synoptic question. See Church Reading, Hort, F. J. A., Luke, Mark, Matthew, and List of Various Readings
Thaddæus, 197-199
Tischendorf, 34, 198, 425
Twelve, The, 186
- VIENNE and Lyons; the Letter of the Churches of, 518
- WEISS, Bernhard, 58, 150, 164, 241, 334, 335, 370, 515, 521, 530
Westcott, Bishop, 316
Wetstein, 102
Whately, Archbishop, 278
Wilderness; meaning of the term, 44, 151
Word, The; as a technical Christian term, 245, 246
- ZAHN, 28
Zeno, 19

VARIOUS READINGS

| | Page |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| St Matthew—iii. 3 | 43 |
| iii. 17 | 57 |
| v. 22 | 115, 121, 131, 415 |
| vi. 13 | 138 |
| viii. 28 | 269, <i>sqg.</i> |
| viii. 30 | 277 |
| ix. 34 | 209 |
| x. 3 | 197, <i>sqg.</i> |
| xi. 19 | 239, <i>sq.</i> |
| xiv. 24 | 319 |
| xvi. 2, 3 | 220 |
| xvii. 21 | 373, <i>sqg.</i> |
| xviii. 11 | 388 |
| xix. 16, 17 | 398-407 |
| xix. 20 | 397 |
| xx. 22, 23 | 420 |
| xxi. 1 | 425 |
| xxi. 44 | 446 |
| xxvi. 7 | 485 |
| xxvii. 49 | 523, <i>sqg.</i> |
| St Mark—i. 1 | 34, <i>sqg.</i> |
| i. 14 | 82 |
| i. 24 | 94, <i>sq.</i> |
| i. 25 | 97 |
| i. 27 | 99 |
| i. 40 | 148 |
| i. 41 | 149, <i>sq.</i> |
| iii. 14 | 191, <i>sqg.</i> |
| iii. 15 | 291 |
| iii. 18 | 198 |
| v. 1 | 269, <i>sqg.</i> |
| vi. 3 | 409 |
| vi. 20 | 304 |
| vi. 22 | 305, <i>sqg.</i> |
| vii. 24, 31 | 334 |

| | Page |
|-------------------------|------------------|
| St Mark—viii. 26 | 348 |
| ix. 29 | 373, <i>sqg.</i> |
| ix. 41 | 382, <i>sqg.</i> |
| x. 12 | 394 |
| x. 24 | 413, <i>sqg.</i> |
| xi. 1 | 425 |
| xi. 3 | 425, <i>sq.</i> |
| xv. 44 | 527 |
| St Luke—iii. 22 | 57 |
| iv. 8 | 68 |
| iv. 44 | 108 |
| v. 39 | 173 |
| vi. 1 | 175, <i>sqg.</i> |
| vi. 35 | 134, <i>sq.</i> |
| vi. 48 | 145 |
| vii. 19 | 227, <i>sq.</i> |
| vii. 19, 20 | 229, <i>sq.</i> |
| viii. 26 | 269, <i>sqg.</i> |
| ix. 35 | 366, <i>sq.</i> |
| x. 21 | 298 |
| xii. 11 | 468 |
| xix. 29 | 425 |
| xxii. 19, 20 | 493 |
| xxii. 43, 44 | 62, 496 |
| xxiii. 17 | 513 |
| xxiii. 34 | 517, <i>sq.</i> |
| xxiii. 45 | 519 |
| xxiv. 19 | 96 |
| St John—i. 28 | 271 |
| iv. 1 | 228 |
| xix. 29 | 522 |
| Acts—xv. 29 | 142 |

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

*The figures in block type refer to passages which are commented on,
not merely referred to.*

| | Page | | Page |
|------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|----------|
| Genesis —iv. 8; vi. 1 . . . | 169 | Psalms —viii. 2 . . . | 437 |
| xv. 4; xxxviii. 29 . . . | 59 | xxxi. 5 . . . | 520 |
| Exodus —viii. 19 . . . | 208 | lxix. 21 . . . | 516 |
| xvi. 25, 26 . . . | 89 | Isaiah —v. 1, 4 . . . | 445 |
| xxii. 25 . . . | 456 | ix. 1 . . . | 82 |
| xxiv. 1 . . . | 202 | xxxiv. 4 . . . | 475 |
| xxxiv. 28 . . . | 61 | xxxvi. 22; xxxvii. 1 . . . | 503 |
| Leviticus —ii. 13 . . . | 387 | xl. 9; lii. 7 . . . | 38 |
| xix. 18; xxv. 36 . . . | 456 | Jeremiah —xxvi. 18 . . . | 502 |
| Numbers —xi. 16 . . . | 202 | xxxvi. 24 . . . | 503 |
| Deuteronomy —v. 6-21 . . . | 411 | Ezekiel —i. 1 . . . | 58 |
| xv. 9, 10 . . . | 135 | iii. 19 . . . | 465 |
| xxiii. 6 . . . | 136 | viii. 3 . . . | 60 |
| xxiii. 19 . . . | 456 | xxxiii. 9 . . . | 465 |
| xxiv. 1 . . . | 130 | xlili. 24 . . . | 387 |
| 1 Samuel —xii. 6 . . . | 191 | Hosea —i. 2 . . . | 34 |
| 2 Samuel —xv. 16-18 . . . | 313 | vi. 2 . . . | 218 |
| 1 Kings —xix. 8 . . . | 61 | vi. 6 . . . | 170, 218 |
| 2 Kings —v. 11 . . . | 103 | Zechariah —ix. 9 . . . | 427 |
| 2 Kings —xxii. 11 . . . | 503 | xi. 12 . . . | 488 |
| Ezra —ix. 12 . . . | 136 | xiii. 7 . . . | 494 |
| Psalms —ii. 7 . . . | 57 | Malachi —iii. 1 . . . | 42 |
| | | Tobit —iv. 15 . . . | 142 |
| | | Bel and the Dragon . . . | 60 |

NEW TESTAMENT

| | Page | | Page |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| St Matthew—ii. 23 | 81 | St Matthew—vi. 22, 23 | 119, 140 |
| iii. 1-3 | 40 | vi. 23 | 117 |
| iii. 2 | 45 | vi. 24 | 140 |
| iii. 4-6 | 47 | vi. 25 | 141 |
| iii. 7-10 | 48 | vi. 33 | 259 |
| iii. 9 | 50 | vii. 2 | 141, 259 |
| iii. 10 | 144, 249 | vii. 3-12 | 142 |
| iii. 11 | 441 | vii. 13a; 15-27 | 143 |
| iii. 11, 12 | 51 | vii. 16-25 | 144 |
| iii. 13-15 | 54 | vii. 17, 18, 19 | 249 |
| iii. 15 | 409 | vii. 21-23; 22 | 143 |
| iii. 16, 17 | 55 | vii. 26, 27 | 145 |
| iv. 1 | 59 | vii. 28b, 29 | 89 |
| iv. 2-11 | 61 | vii. 29 | 172 |
| iv. 12 | 75, 77, 79, 81 | viii. 1 | 146, 147 |
| iv. 12-17 | 75 | viii. 2 | 148 |
| iv. 13 | 84, 161, 167, 241 | viii. 3, 4 | 149 |
| iv. 17 | 45, 292 | viii. 5-13 | 152 |
| iv. 18 | 100 | viii. 8 | 52 |
| iv. 18-22 | 72, 83 | viii. 11, 12 | 156 |
| iv. 23 | 38, 82, 86, 193 | viii. 12 | 38 |
| iv. 23-25 | 185 | viii. 14a | 99 |
| iv. 24 | 104 | viii. 14b, 15 | 100 |
| iv. 24, 25 | 185 | viii. 16, 17 | 103 |
| iv. 33 | 250 | viii. 18; 23 | 264 |
| v. 1, 2 | 110 | viii. 19-22 | 65, 267 |
| v. 3-12 | 112 | viii. 24-27 | 265 |
| v. 13 | 117, 387 | viii. 28 | 273 |
| v. 14-16 | 118 | viii. 28a | 268 |
| v. 15 | 118, 257 | viii. 28b | 272 |
| v. 17-20 | 119 | viii. 29 | 96, 273 |
| v. 18 | 121, 233 | viii. 30-32 | 274 |
| v. 20; 21-26 | 121 | viii. 33, 34 | 279 |
| v. 21-48 | 119, 121 | ix. 1 | 241 |
| v. 22 | 115, 131, 415 | ix. 1-8 | 157 |
| v. 25, 26 | 123 | ix. 1-17 | 282 |
| v. 27-30 | 125 | ix. 9 | 164 |
| v. 29 | 216 | ix. 10 | 137 |
| v. 29, 30 | 386 | ix. 10-13 | 167 |
| v. 31, 32 | 128 | ix. 13 | 170, 175 |
| v. 32 | 216, 391, 415 | ix. 14-17 | 171 |
| v. 33-42 | 132 | ix. 18 | 231 |
| v. 39 | 133 | ix. 18, 19 | 281 |
| v. 40 | 133 | ix. 20-22 | 283 |
| v. 42 | 134 | ix. 23-26 | 285 |
| v. 43-48 | 135 | ix. 27-31 | 423 |
| v. 45 | 136 | ix. 28 | 375 |
| v. 46, 47 | 136, 137, 169 | ix. 30 | 150 |
| v. 48 | 137, 141 | ix. 32 | 208, 338 |
| vi. 1-18 | 137 | ix. 32-34 | 205, 206 |
| vi. 14, 15 | 138 | ix. 34 | 209 |
| vi. 19-21 | 140 | ix. 35 | 38, 82, 86, 290 |
| vi. 19-34 | 139 | ix. 36 | 311 |

| | Page |
|--------------------------------|---------------|
| St Matthew—ix. 36-38 | 190 |
| x. 1 | 186, 291 |
| x. 2-4 | 189, 194 |
| x. 3 | 197 |
| x. 5b, 6 | 291 |
| x. 7 | 44, 292 |
| x. 8 | 193 |
| x. 8-10 | 292 |
| x. 10 | 296 |
| x. 11 | 295 |
| x. 11-14 | 293 |
| x. 15 | 296 |
| x. 16 | 295, 409 |
| x. 17, 18 | 464 |
| x. 19 | 468 |
| x. 19-22 | 466 |
| x. 24 | 330 |
| x. 25 | 207 |
| x. 26-28a | 257 |
| x. 32, 33 | 359 |
| x. 37-39 | 357 |
| x. 39 | 416 |
| x. 40 | 295 |
| x. 41 | 384 |
| x. 42 | 381, 382 |
| xi. 1 | 188 |
| xi. 2 | 302 |
| xi. 2, 3 | 227 |
| xi. 3 | 230 |
| xi. 4-6 | 231 |
| xi. 7-11 | 232 |
| xi. 7-19 | 232 |
| xi. 8 | 47 |
| xi. 10 | 40, 41, 42 |
| xi. 12 | 234, 235 |
| xi. 12-15 | 232 |
| xi. 13 | 39 |
| xi. 14 | 406 |
| xi. 14, 15 | 235 |
| xi. 16-19 | 232, 237 |
| xi. 19 | 137, 169, 239 |
| xi. 20 | 80 |
| xi. 20-24 | 297 |
| xi. 21 | 296 |
| xi. 25-27 | 297 |
| xi. 27 | 299 |
| xii. 1-8 | 174 |
| xii. 6 | 220 |
| xii. 7 | 170 |
| xii. 9-14 | 177 |
| xii. 11, 12 | 181 |
| xii. 15a | 182 |
| xii. 15b, 16 | 185 |
| xii. 22 | 208, 338 |
| xii. 22-24 | 206 |
| xii. 22-28 | 205 |
| xii. 24 | 209 |
| xii. 25 | 207 |

| | Page |
|------------------------------|----------|
| St Matthew—xii. 27 | 225 |
| xii. 27, 28 | 208, 209 |
| xii. 29 | 210 |
| xii. 30 | 210, 381 |
| xii. 31, 32 | 210 |
| xii. 33-37 | 212 |
| xii. 33 | 144 |
| xii. 34 | 50 |
| xii. 38-40 | 216 |
| xii. 40 | 217 |
| xii. 41 | 175 |
| xii. 41, 42 | 219 |
| xii. 43-45 | 222 |
| xii. 46-50 | 213 |
| xiii. 1-3a | 242 |
| xiii. 3b, 4 | 244 |
| xiii. 5, 6 | 247 |
| xiii. 7 | 248 |
| xiii. 8, 9 | 249 |
| xiii. 10-15 | 250 |
| xiii. 12 | 258, 259 |
| xiii. 16, 17 | 300 |
| xiii. 19 | 245 |
| xiii. 20, 21 | 247 |
| xiii. 21 | 245 |
| xiii. 22 | 248 |
| xiii. 23 | 249 |
| xiii. 26 | 253 |
| xiii. 31-33 | 262 |
| xiii. 34, 35 | 263 |
| xiii. 35 | 264 |
| xiii. 38 | 38 |
| xiii. 43 | 263 |
| xiii. 51 | 264 |
| xiii. 53 | 73 |
| xiii. 53-58 | 73, 287 |
| xiii. 54 | 301 |
| xiii. 55 | 407 |
| xiii. 57 | 290 |
| xiv. 1-4 | 300 |
| xiv. 3 | 77 |
| xiv. 3, 4 | 303 |
| xiv. 5 | 303 |
| xiv. 6a-7 | 304 |
| xiv. 8-12 | 308 |
| xiv. 9 | 303, 308 |
| xiv. 13a | 310 |
| xiv. 13b, 14 | 311 |
| xiv. 15-18 | 313 |
| xiv. 19-21 | 314 |
| xiv. 22, 23 | 317 |
| xiv. 24 | 319 |
| xiv. 24-33 | 318 |
| xiv. 28-33 | 321 |
| xiv. 33 | 343 |
| xiv. 34-36 | 325 |
| xv. 1, 2 | 169, 327 |
| xv. 3-9 | 329 |

542 INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

| | Page | | Page |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| St Matthew—xv. 4 | 411 | St Matthew—xix. 27-30 | 416 |
| xv. 10-20 | 329 | xix. 28 187, 416, 417 | 417 |
| xv. 21 | 334 | xx. 17 | 188 |
| xv. 21-28 | 332 | xx. 17-19 | 418 |
| xv. 24 | 292 | xx. 20-23 | 419 |
| xv. 26 | 142 | xx. 24-28 | 420 |
| xv. 29a | 337 | xx. 29-34 422, 423 | 422, 423 |
| xv. 29b-31 | 338 | xxi. 1-11 | 424 |
| xv. 32-39 | 339 | xxi. 10 428, 432 | 428, 432 |
| xv. 38 | 315 | xxi. 12-17 | 431 |
| xvi. 1, 2a, 4a | 344 | xxi. 17 | 437 |
| xvi. 1, 2a, 4 | 216 | xxi. 18, 19 | 429 |
| xvi. 2b, 3 | 220 | xxi. 20-22 | 437 |
| xvi. 4b-12 | 345 | xxi. 21 | 373 |
| xvi. 6 | 347 | xxi. 23 | 438 |
| xvi. 9-10 | 340 | xxi. 24-27 | 440 |
| xvi. 13-20 | 348 | xxi. 25 | 235 |
| xvi. 17 | 351 | xxi. 31, 32 | 170 |
| xvi. 17-19 | 350 | xxi. 33a | 442 |
| xvi. 18 | 85 | xxi. 33b-36 | 443 |
| xvi. 21 | 66 | xxi. 37-42 | 444 |
| xvi. 21-23 | 352 | xxi. 43 | 445 |
| xvi. 24-26 | 355 | xxi. 44-46 | 446 |
| xvi. 25 | 416 | xxii. 15-22 | 447 |
| xvi. 27 219, 358 | 358 | xxii. 23-28 | 451 |
| xvi. 28 | 361 | xxii. 29-33 | 452 |
| xvii. 1 | 363 | xxii. 34-40 | 454 |
| xvii. 2-8 | 365 | xxii. 41-46 | 457 |
| xvii. 5 | 366 | xxiii. 6, 7 | 459 |
| xvii. 10 | 235 | xxiii. 33 | 50 |
| xvii. 13 235, 407 | 407 | xxiv. 1, 2 | 461 |
| xvii. 9-13 | 367 | xxiv. 3 | 462 |
| xvii. 14-17 | 368 | xxiv. 4-8 | 463 |
| xvii. 18 371, 372 | 372 | xxiv. 9-14 | 464 |
| xvii. 20 | 437 | xxiv. 14 38, 82, 477 | 38, 82, 477 |
| xvii. 19-21 | 372 | xxiv. 15-18 | 469 |
| xvii. 22, 23 | 376 | xxiv. 19-22 | 471 |
| xviii. 1-5 | 378 | xxiv. 23-28 | 472 |
| xviii. 6 382, 384 | 384 | xxiv. 29-31 | 473 |
| xviii. 7 | 385 | xxiv. 30 | 219 |
| xviii. 8 | 216 | xxiv. 32 | 221 |
| xviii. 8-9 125, 386 | 125, 386 | xxiv. 32 33 | 474 |
| xviii. 10 382, 388 | 382, 388 | xxiv. 34-36 | 475 |
| xviii. 11 388, 389 | 388, 389 | xxiv. 37-42 | 477 |
| xviii. 21 | 438 | xxiv. 43, 44 | 478 |
| xix. 1, 2 | 389 | xxiv. 45-51 | 479 |
| xix. 3 | 390 | xxv. 13 | 477 |
| xix. 3-12 | 128 | xxv. 14 | 480 |
| xix. 4-8 | 392 | xxv. 29 | 260 |
| xix. 8 | 122 | xxv. 31 | 219 |
| xix. 9 128, 216, 391, 415 | 128, 216, 391, 415 | xxvi. 1-5 | 480 |
| xix. 9-12 | 393 | xxvi. 2 | 434 |
| xix. 12 127, 394 | 127, 394 | xxvi. 6-13 | 481 |
| xix. 13-15 | 395 | xxvi. 7 | 485 |
| xix. 16-22 | 396 | xxvi. 14 188, 486 | 188, 486 |
| xix. 17 407, 415 | 407, 415 | xxvi. 14-16 | 487 |
| xix. 18 | 330 | xxvi. 17-19 | 488 |
| xix. 23-26 | 412 | xxvi. 20 187, 188 | 187, 188 |

| | Page |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| St Matthew—xxvi. 20-30 | 490 |
| xxvi. 31-35 | 494 |
| xxvi. 36-46 | 495 |
| xxvi. 46 | 107 |
| xxvi. 47 | 188 |
| xxvi. 47-56 | 498 |
| xxvi. 57-61 | 500 |
| xxvi. 64 | 219 |
| xxvi. 62-68 | 502 |
| xxvi. 69-75 | 507 |
| xxvii. 1, 2 | 509 |
| xxvii. 3-10 | 510 |
| xxvii. 11-14 | 510 |
| xxvii. 15-18, 20 | 513 |
| xxvii. 21-23, 26; 27-31 | 514 |
| xxvii. 32-34 | 516 |
| xxvii. 35-44 | 517 |
| xxvii. 45 | 519 |
| xxvii. 46-49 | 520 |
| xxvii. 49 | 523 |
| xxvii. 50, 51, 54 | 522 |
| xxvii. 55, 56 | 525 |
| xxvii. 57-61 | 526 |
| xxviii. 1-10 | 528 |

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| St Mark—i. 1 | 33 |
| i. 2-4 | 40 |
| i. 5, 6 | 47 |
| i. 6 | 47, 172 |
| i. 7, 8 | 51 |
| i. 7 | 441 |
| i. 9 | 54 |
| i. 10 | 56 |
| i. 10, 11 | 55 |
| i. 12 | 39, 59 |
| i. 13 | 61 |
| i. 14 | 38, 77, 79, 81, 82 |
| i. 14, 15 | 75 |
| i. 15 | 37, 45, 292 |
| i. 16-20 | 72, 83 |
| i. 21a | 88 |
| i. 21b | 89 |
| i. 21-28 | 72 |
| i. 22 | 89, 172 |
| i. 23 | 89, 93 |
| i. 24 | 94 |
| i. 25 | 105, 186 |
| i. 25, 26 | 97 |
| i. 27 | 98 |
| i. 28; 29 | 99 |
| i. 29-34 | 72 |
| i. 30, 31 | 100 |
| i. 32-34 | 103 |
| i. 34 | 104, 105 |
| i. 35 | 107, 152, 317, 496 |
| i. 35-38 | 72, 106 |
| i. 38 | 107 |

| | Page |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| St Mark—i. 39 | 107, 172 |
| i. 40 | 146, 148 |
| i. 41-44 | 149 |
| i. 45 | 151 |
| ii. 1 | 203 |
| ii. 1-12 | 157 |
| ii. 6 | 170 |
| ii. 9; 12 | 163 |
| ii. 13, 14 | 164 |
| ii. 15-17 | 167 |
| ii. 18-22 | 171 |
| ii. 23-28 | 174 |
| iii. 1-6 | 177 |
| iii. 7a | 182 |
| iii. 7 | 79 |
| iii. 7, 8 | 86 |
| iii. 7b-12 | 185 |
| iii. 8 | 336 |
| iii. 9 | 242, 264 |
| iii. 10 | 193 |
| iii. 11 | 105 |
| iii. 13 | 190 |
| iii. 13-15 | 186 |
| iii. 14 | 191 |
| iii. 15 | 91, 291 |
| iii. 16 | 85, 100, 207 |
| iii. 16-19a | 194 |
| iii. 19b-21 | 202 |
| iii. 21 | 215 |
| iii. 22 | 328 |
| iii. 22-26 | 205, 344 |
| iii. 27-30 | 210 |
| iii. 31-35 | 213 |
| iv. 1 | 264 |
| iv. 1, 2 | 242 |
| iv. 3, 4 | 244 |
| iv. 5, 6 | 247 |
| iv. 7 | 248 |
| iv. 8, 9 | 249 |
| iv. 10 | 255 |
| iv. 10-13 | 250 |
| iv. 11 | 253 |
| iv. 13 | 252 |
| iv. 14, 15 | 245 |
| iv. 16, 17 | 247 |
| iv. 17 | 245 |
| iv. 18, 19 | 248 |
| iv. 20 | 249 |
| iv. 21 | 253 |
| iv. 21, 22 | 118 |
| iv. 21-23 | 256 |
| iv. 24 | 141, 253, 260 |
| iv. 24, 25 | 258 |
| iv. 25 | 259 |
| iv. 26 | 253 |
| iv. 26-29 | 260 |
| iv. 30 | 238, 253 |
| iv. 30-32 | 262 |

544 INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

| | Page |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| St Mark—iv. 32 | 244 |
| iv. 33, 34 | 251, 263 |
| iv. 34 | 264 |
| iv. 35, 36 | 264 |
| iv. 37-41 | 265 |
| iv. 39 | 101 |
| iv. 41 | 99 |
| v. 1, 2 | 268 |
| v. 3-5 | 272 |
| v. 4 | 273 |
| v. 6-10 | 273 |
| v. 7 | 96 |
| v. 7, 8 | 95 |
| v. 11-13 | 274 |
| v. 14-20 | 279 |
| v. 21-24a | 281 |
| v. 22 | 231 |
| v. 24b-34 | 283 |
| v. 35-37 | 284 |
| v. 38-43 | 285 |
| vi. 1 | 73 |
| vi. 1-6a | 287 |
| vi. 3 | 407 |
| vi. 4 | 290 |
| vi. 6b | 290 |
| vi. 7 | 91, 190, 207, 291 |
| vi. 8, 9 | 292 |
| vi. 9 | 53 |
| vi. 10, 11 | 293 |
| vi. 12 | 292 |
| vi. 12, 13 | 291 |
| vi. 14 | 184 |
| vi. 14-18 | 300 |
| vi. 17 | 77 |
| vi. 17, 18 | 303 |
| vi. 19, 20 | 303 |
| vi. 21-23 | 304 |
| vi. 22 | 305 |
| vi. 24-29 | 308 |
| vi. 25-27 | 305 |
| vi. 30 | 193, 309 |
| vi. 31, 32 | 310 |
| vi. 33, 34 | 311 |
| vi. 35-38 | 313 |
| vi. 39-44 | 314 |
| vi. 45 | 80, 311, 319, 342 |
| vi. 45-47 | 317 |
| vi. 46 | 496 |
| vi. 47 | 314 |
| vi. 48-52 | 318 |
| vi. 51 | 343 |
| vi. 51, 52 | 321 |
| vi. 53-56 | 325 |
| vii. 1-5 | 327 |
| vii. 6-13 | 329 |
| vii. 10 | 411 |
| vii. 14-23 | 329 |
| vii. 24a | 334 |

| | Page |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| St Mark—vii. 24-30 | 332 |
| vii. 27 | 366 |
| vii. 31 | 334, 337 |
| vii. 32 | 348 |
| vii. 32-37 | 338 |
| vii. 33 | 348 |
| viii. 1-10 | 339 |
| viii. 9 | 315 |
| viii. 11, 12 | 216, 344 |
| viii. 13-21 | 345 |
| viii. 19, 20 | 340 |
| viii. 22 | 80, 348 |
| viii. 22-26 | 347 |
| viii. 23 | 348 |
| viii. 27-30 | 348 |
| viii. 31 | 419 |
| viii. 31-33 | 352 |
| viii. 33 | 97 |
| viii. 34 | 353 |
| viii. 34-37 | 355 |
| viii. 35 | 37, 360, 416 |
| viii. 38 | 219, 358 |
| ix. 1 | 361 |
| ix. 2a | 363 |
| ix. 2b-8 | 365 |
| ix. 9-13 | 367 |
| ix. 10 | 354, 377 |
| ix. 11 | 235 |
| ix. 13 | 406 |
| ix. 14-19 | 368 |
| ix. 20 | 97 |
| ix. 20-25 | 370 |
| ix. 21, 22 | 118 |
| ix. 25 | 97, 226, 370 |
| ix. 26 | 97 |
| ix. 26, 27 | 371 |
| ix. 28, 29 | 372 |
| ix. 29 | 373 |
| ix. 30-32 | 376 |
| ix. 30-33 | 341 |
| ix. 30 | 377 |
| ix. 31 | 66 |
| ix. 33 | 393 |
| ix. 33-37 | 378 |
| ix. 35 | 187, 421 |
| ix. 36 | 395 |
| ix. 38-40 | 379 |
| ix. 41 | 381, 382, 385 |
| ix. 42 | 97, 384 |
| ix. 42, 43; 45, 47 | 366 |
| ix. 43 | 127 |
| ix. 43-47 | 125 |
| ix. 43-48 | 386 |
| ix. 43-50 | 385 |
| ix. 48, 49, 50 | 387 |
| ix. 49, 50 | 386 |
| ix. 50 | 117 |
| x. 1 | 389 |

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES 545

| | Page | | Page |
|------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|
| St Mark—x. 2 | 390 | St Mark—xiii. 33-37 | 477 |
| x. 2-12 | 128 | xiii. 34 | 480 |
| x. 3-9 | 392 | xiii. 34, 35, 37 | 477 |
| x. 10-12 | 393 | xiv. 1 | 434 |
| x. 12 | 394 | xiv. 1, 2 | 480 |
| x. 13-16 | 395 | xiv. 2 | 485 |
| x. 17 | 395 | xiv. 3 | 481, 484 |
| x. 17-22 | 396 | xiv. 3-9 | 481 |
| x. 23-27 | 412 | xiv. 10, 11 | 487 |
| x. 28-31 | 416 | xiv. 12-16 | 488 |
| x. 29 | 37, 416 | xiv. 17-21 | 490 |
| x. 30 | 116, 416 | xiv. 21 | 366 |
| x. | 187 | xiv. 22-26 | 490 |
| x. 32-34 | 418 | xiv. 27-31 | 494 |
| x. 33 | 419 | xiv. 28 | 494 |
| x. 35-40 | 419 | xiv. 31 | 495 |
| x. 41-45 | 420 | xiv. 32-42 | 495 |
| x. 46-52 | 422 | xiv. 41, 42, 44 | 419 |
| xi. 1-11 | 424 | xiv. 42 | 107 |
| xi. 3 | 425 | xiv. 43 | 419 |
| xi. 12-14 | 429 | xiv. 43-52 | 498 |
| xi. 15-18 | 431 | xiv. 51 | 499 |
| xi. 19-26 | 437 | xiv. 53-59 | 500 |
| xi. 24 | 68 | xiv. 60-65 | 502 |
| xi. 25 | 139 | xiv. 64 | 419, 503 |
| xi. 27, 28 | 438 | xiv. 66-72 | 507 |
| xi. 29-33 | 440 | xv. 1 | 419, 509 |
| xi. 32 | 440 | xv. 2-5 | 510 |
| xii. 1 | 434 | xv. 6-11 | 513 |
| xii. 1a | 442 | xv. 12-15 | 514 |
| xii. 1b-5 | 443 | xv. 16-20 | 514 |
| xii. 6-11 | 444 | xv. 19 | 419 |
| xii. 12 | 446 | xv. 21-23 | 516 |
| xii. 14 | 450 | xv. 24-32 | 517 |
| xii. 13-17 | 447 | xv. 33 | 519 |
| xii. 18-23 | 451 | xv. 34-36 | 520 |
| xii. 24-27 | 452 | xv. 37-39 | 522 |
| xii. 28-34 | 454 | xv. 40, 41 | 525 |
| xii. 35-37 | 457 | xv. 42-47 | 526 |
| xii. 38 | 330 | xv. 44, 45 | 527 |
| xii. 38-40 | 459 | xvi. 1-8 | 528 |
| xii. 41-44 | 460 | xvi. 2 | 104 |
| xiii. 1, 2 | 461 | xvi. 9 | 225 |
| xiii. 3, 4 | 462 | xvi. 11, 13, 14 | 343 |
| xiii. 5-8 | 463 | | |
| xiii. 5-13 | 469 | St Luke—i. 5 | 108 |
| xiii. 9, 10 | 464 | i. 17 | 236, 406 |
| xiii. 10 | 37, 83 | iii. 1 | 303 |
| xiii. 11-13 | 466 | iii. 2 | 44 |
| xiii. 14-16 | 469 | iii. 2-4 | 40 |
| xiii. 17-20 | 471 | iii. 3 | 47 |
| xiii. 21, 23 | 472 | iii. 7-9 | 48 |
| xiii. 24-27 | 473 | iii. 8 | 50 |
| xiii. 26 | 219 | iii. 9 | 144 |
| xiii. 28, 29 | 474 | iii. 16 | 51, 441 |
| xiii. 30 | 476 | iii. 17 | 51 |
| xiii. 30-32 | 475 | iii. 18 | 50 |
| xiii. 32 | 476, 480 | iii. 19, 20 | 302 |

546 INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

| | Page | | Page |
|------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| St Luke—iii. 20 | 78 | St Luke—vi. 29<i>b</i> | 133 |
| iii. 21 | 54 | vi. 31 | 142 |
| iii. 21 <i>b</i> , 22 | 55 | vi. 32-34 | 136, 169 |
| iii. 22 | 56 | vi. 32 | 137 |
| iv. 1. | 59 | vi. 34, 35 | 135 |
| iv. 2-13 | 61 | vi. 35 <i>a</i> | 134 |
| iv. 14 | 81, 99 | vi. 35 <i>b</i> | 136 |
| iv. 14, 15 | 75 | vi. 36 | 137 |
| iv. 15 | 89 | vi. 38 | 141, 258, 259 |
| iv. 16 | 287 | vi. 39 | 330 |
| iv. 22 | 288 | vi. 41, 42 | 142 |
| iv. 23 | 88 | vi. 43-48 | 144 |
| iv. 24 | 290 | vi. 43-45 | 212 |
| iv. 31 <i>a</i> | 88, 172 | vi. 49 | 145 |
| iv. 31 <i>b</i> , 32 | 89 | vii. 1-10 | 152 |
| iv. 32 | 47 | vii. 6 | 52 |
| iv. 33 | 93 | vii. 13 | 228 |
| iv. 34 | 94 | vii. 17 | 108 |
| iv. 35 | 97 | vii. 18-20 | 227 |
| iv. 36 <i>a</i> | 91, 98 | vii. 19 | 228, 229, 230 |
| iv. 36 <i>b</i> | 98 | vii. 20 | 230 |
| iv. 37 | 99 | vii. 21-23 | 231 |
| iv. 38 <i>a</i> | 99, 100 | vii. 24-35 | 232 |
| iv. 38 <i>b</i> , 39 | 100 | vii. 25 | 47 |
| iv. 39 | 266 | vii. 27 | 40, 41, 42 |
| iv. 40, 41 | 103 | vii. 29, 30 | 232 |
| iv. 41 | 105 | vii. 31-35 | 232, 237 |
| iv. 42, 43 | 106 | vii. 34 | 169 |
| iv. 44 | 107 | vii. 36 | 168 |
| iv. 44 | 47 | vii. 36-40 | 481 |
| v. 1-11 | 83, 85 | vii. 37 | 170 |
| v. 8 | 85 | viii. 1 | 243 |
| v. 9 | 267 | viii. 2 | 225 |
| v. 12 | 148 | viii. 3 | 65, 183, 513, 526 |
| v. 13, 14 | 149 | viii. 4 | 242 |
| v. 15, 16 | 151 | viii. 5 | 244 |
| v. 17 | 110 | viii. 6 | 247 |
| v. 17-26 | 157 | viii. 7 | 248 |
| v. 23 | 74 | viii. 8 | 249 |
| v. 27, 28 | 164 | viii. 9, 10 | 250 |
| v. 29-32 | 167 | viii. 11 <i>b</i> , 12 | 245 |
| v. 31 | 74 | viii. 13 | 247 |
| v. 33-39 | 171 | viii. 14 | 248 |
| vi. 1-5 | 174 | viii. 15 | 249 |
| vi. 6-11 | 177 | viii. 16 | 257 |
| vi. 12 | 190, 317 | viii. 16, 17 | 118, 256 |
| vi. 12, 13 | 186 | viii. 18 | 255, 258, 259 |
| vi. 13 | 190, 191 | viii. 19-21 | 213 |
| vi. 14-16 | 194 | viii. 22 | 264 |
| vi. 17-19 | 185 | viii. 23-25 | 265 |
| vi. 17 | 110 | viii. 26, 27 <i>a</i> | 268 |
| vi. 20 <i>a</i> | 110 | viii. 27 <i>b</i> ; 29 <i>b</i> | 272 |
| vi. 20 <i>b</i> -26 | 112 | viii. 28 | 96 |
| vi. 20 | 186 | viii. 28, 29 <i>a</i> , 30, 31 | 273 |
| vi. 24 | 113, 137 | viii. 29 | 60 |
| vi. 25 | 113 | viii. 32, 33 | 274 |
| vi. 27 | 132 | viii. 34-39 | 279 |
| vi. 27, 28 | 135 | viii. 40-42 <i>a</i> | 281 |

| | Page |
|---|----------|
| St Luke—viii. 41 | 231 |
| viii. 42 <i>b</i> -48 | 283 |
| viii. 49-51 | 284 |
| viii. 52-56 | 285 |
| ix. 1 | 91, 190 |
| ix. 1, 2 | 291 |
| ix. 2-6 | 193, 292 |
| ix. 3 | 292 |
| ix. 4, 5 | 293 |
| ix. 6 | 292 |
| ix. 7 | 304 |
| ix. 7-9 | 300 |
| ix. 9 | 513 |
| ix. 10 <i>a</i> | 309 |
| ix. 10 <i>b</i> | 310 |
| ix. 11 | 311 |
| ix. 12, 13 | 313 |
| ix. 14-17 | 314 |
| ix. 18-21 | 348 |
| ix. 22 | 352 |
| ix. 23 | 357 |
| ix. 23-25 | 355 |
| ix. 26 | 358, 359 |
| ix. 27 | 361 |
| ix. 28 | 284, 363 |
| ix. 29 | 365 |
| ix. 30-36 <i>a</i> | 366 |
| ix. 30 | 377 |
| ix. 34 | 366 |
| ix. 36 <i>b</i> , 37 <i>a</i> | 367 |
| ix. 37 <i>b</i> -41 | 368 |
| ix. 37, 38 | 295, 327 |
| ix. 42, 43 <i>a</i> | 371 |
| ix. 43 <i>b</i> -45 | 376 |
| ix. 45 | 418 |
| ix. 46-48 | 378 |
| ix. 49, 50 | 379 |
| ix. 57-60 | 267 |
| ix. 57-62 | 65 |
| ix. 61, 62 | 267 |
| x. 1 | 196, 228 |
| x. 2 | 294 |
| x. 3 | 295 |
| x. 4 <i>a</i> | 292 |
| x. 4 | 295 |
| x. 5-11 <i>a</i> | 294 |
| x. 7, 8 | 295 |
| x. 9 | 44 |
| x. 9-11 | 292 |
| x. 12 | 296 |
| x. 13 | 80 |
| x. 13-15 | 297 |
| x. 16 | 295 |
| x. 17 | 309, 380 |
| x. 19 | 91 |
| x. 21, 22 | 297 |
| x. 22 | 299 |
| x. 23, 24 | 300 |

| | Page |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| St Luke—x. 25 | 401, 453 |
| x. 25-29 | 455 |
| x. 38-42 | 484 |
| xi. 1-4 | 138 |
| xi. 9-13 | 142 |
| xi. 14 | 338 |
| xi. 14, 15 | 206 |
| xi. 14-20 | 205 |
| xi. 15 | 209 |
| xi. 16, 29, 30 | 216 |
| xi. 17 | 207 |
| xi. 19 | 225 |
| xi. 19, 20 | 208, 209 |
| xi. 21, 22 | 210 |
| xi. 23 | 210, 381 |
| xi. 24-26 | 222 |
| xi. 27 | 526 |
| xi. 27, 28 | 215 |
| xi. 30 | 217 |
| xi. 31 | 175 |
| xi. 31, 32 | 219 |
| xi. 33 | 118, 119, 257 |
| xi. 34-36 | 119, 140 |
| xi. 37, 38 | 327 |
| xi. 39-52 | 458 |
| xi. 43 | 459 |
| xii. 1 | 347 |
| xii. 2-4 <i>a</i> | 257 |
| xii. 8-9 | 359 |
| xii. 10 | 210 |
| xii. 11, 12 | 466 |
| xii. 11 | 468 |
| xii. 14-19 | 466 |
| xii. 21 | 114 |
| xii. 22-31 | 139-141 |
| xii. 24 | 244 |
| xii. 31 | 259 |
| xii. 33 | 412 |
| xii. 33, 34 | 139 |
| xii. 35, 36 | 480 |
| xii. 37, 38 | 141 |
| xii. 38 | 479 |
| xii. 39, 40 | 478 |
| xii. 41 | 478 |
| xii. 42-46 | 479 |
| xii. 50 | 420 |
| xii. 54-57 | 221 |
| xii. 58, 59 | 123 |
| xiii. 14 | 178 |
| xiii. 15 | 181 |
| xiii. 18 | 238 |
| xiii. 18-21 | 262 |
| xiii. 24 <i>a</i> | 143 |
| xiii. 28, 29 | 156 |
| xiii. 31 | 182, 183, 347 |
| xiii. 32 | 183, 218 |
| xiii. 33 | 377 |
| xiv. 5 | 181 |

548 INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

| | Page | | Page |
|------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------|
| St Luke—xiv. 12 | 135 | St Luke—xxi. 21 | 470 |
| xiv. 15 | 457 | xxi. 23 | 471 |
| xiv. 25-27 | 357 | xxi. 24 | 477 |
| xiv. 34 | 387 | xxi. 25-28 | 473 |
| xiv. 34, 35 | 117 | xxi. 29 | 221 |
| xv. 1 | 137 | xxi. 29-31 | 474 |
| xvi. 13 | 140 | xxi. 32, 33 | 475 |
| xvi. 16 | 232 | xxi. 36 | 477 |
| xvi. 17 | 121 | xxi. 37 | 495 |
| xvi. 18 | 131 | xxii. 1, 2 | 480 |
| xvi. 25 | 113 | xxii. 3 | 66 |
| xvii. 1 | 385 | xxii. 3-6 | 487 |
| xvii. 1, 2 | 388 | xxii. 7-13 | 488 |
| xvii. 2 | 384 | xxii. 14, 21-23; 15-20, 39 | 490 |
| xvii. 3, 4 | 387 | xxii. 17 | 494 |
| xvii. 6 | 373, 437 | xxii. 19, 20 | 493 |
| xvii. 11 | 390 | xxii. 24-26 | 378 |
| xvii. 20-37 | 473 | xxii. 29, 30 | 416 |
| xvii. 23, 24, 27 | 472 | xxii. 30 | 187, 417 |
| xvii. 26-30 | 477 | xxii. 31-34 | 494 |
| xvii. 31 | 470 | xxii. 38 | 498 |
| xvii. 33 | 357 | xxii. 40-46 | 495 |
| xvii. 34-36 | 477 | xxii. 43 | 62 |
| xviii. 11 | 496 | xxii. 43, 44 | 497 |
| xviii. 12 | 172 | xxii. 47-53 | 498 |
| xviii. 13 | 169, 496 | xxii. 54, 55 | 500 |
| xviii. 15-17 | 395 | xxii. 56-62 | 507 |
| xviii. 18-23 | 396 | xxii. 63-71 | 502 |
| xviii. 24-27 | 412 | xxii. 66 | 419 |
| xviii. 28-30 | 416 | xxiii. 1, 2 | 509 |
| xviii. 31-34 | 418 | xxiii. 3-5 | 510 |
| xviii. 35-43 | 422 | xxiii. 5 | 108 |
| xviii. 37 | 96 | xxiii. 6-12 | 512 |
| xix. 7 | 137, 169 | xxiii. 11 | 515 |
| xix. 10 | 388 | xxiii. 13-19 | 513 |
| xix. 26 | 260 | xxiii. 17 | 513 |
| xix. 28-40 | 424 | xxiii. 20-25 | 514 |
| xix. 45-48 | 431 | xxiii. 26 | 516 |
| xix. 47 | 437 | xxiii. 32-43 | 517 |
| xx. 1, 2 | 438 | xxiii. 34 | 517 |
| xx. 3-8 | 440 | xxiii. 44, 45a | 519 |
| xx. 9a | 442 | xxiii. 44b, 46a | 520 |
| xx. 9b; 10-12 | 443 | xxiii. 45b-47 | 522 |
| xx. 13-17 | 444 | xxiii. 48, 49 | 525 |
| xx. 18, 19 | 446 | xxiii. 50-56 | 526 |
| xx. 20-26 | 447 | xxiii. 56 | 528 |
| xx. 27-33 | 451 | xxiv. 1-11 | 528 |
| xx. 34-40 | 452 | xxiv. 10 | 513, 526 |
| xx. 41-44 | 457 | xxiv. 19 | 96 |
| xx. 45-47 | 459 | | |
| xxi. 1-4 | 460 | St John—i. 26, 27 | 51 |
| xxi. 5, 6 | 461 | i. 27 | 53 |
| xxi. 7 | 462 | i. 28 | 271 |
| xxi. 8-11 | 463 | i. 31, 33 | 406 |
| xxi. 12, 13 | 464 | i. 34 | 56 |
| xxi. 14 | 468 | i. 42 | 85 |
| xxi. 14-19 | 466 | i. 44 | 80 |
| xxi. 20-22 | 469 | ii. 19 | 218 |

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES 549

| | Page |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| St John —iii. 26 | 39 |
| iv. 1 | 75, 228 |
| iv. 44 | 290 |
| v. 33-36 | 441 |
| v. 33 | 39 |
| v. 36 | 240 |
| vi. 1 | 84 |
| vi. 4 | 346 |
| vi. 10 | 315 |
| vi. 17 | 326 |
| vi. 42 | 288 |
| vii. 3-5 | 354 |
| vii. 5, 20 | 204 |
| viii. 48; 52 | 204 |
| viii. 57 | 241 |
| ix. 16 | 178 |
| x. 20 | 204 |
| xi. 1 | 483 |
| xi. 19 | 484 |
| xi. 48 | 435 |
| xii. 1-8 | 481 |
| xii. 12 | 437 |
| xii. 16 | 427 |
| xii. 21 | 80 |
| xiii. 2 | 66 |
| xiii. 16 | 330 |
| xiii. 27 | 66 |
| xiii. 36-38 | 494 |
| xiv. 31 | 107 |
| xv. 20 | 330 |
| xviii. 2 | 495 |
| xviii. 28 | 515 |
| xix. 28 | 516 |
| xix. 29 | 522 |
| xix. 34 | 523 |
| xxi. 7 | 322 |
| Acts —i. 5 | 39, 46 |
| i. 7 | 476 |
| i. 13 | 284 |
| i. 22 | 38 |
| ii. 3 | 52 |
| ii. 20 | 519 |
| ii. 36 | 191 |
| iii. 26 | 333 |
| vii. 52 | 26 |
| viii. 4 | 246 |
| ix. 25 | 342 |
| x. 30 | 335 |
| x. 37 | 108 |
| xi. 16 | 39 |
| xiii. 24 | 45 |
| xiii. 25 | 39 |
| xiii. 33 | 57 |
| xiii. 46 | 333 |
| xv. 7 | 38 |
| xv. 29 | 142 |


| | Page |
|--|------|
| Acts —xvi. 7 | 299 |
| xvi. 17 | 106 |
| xviii. 6 | 333 |
| xix. 4, 6 | 46 |
| xix. 13 | 380 |
| xix. 13 | 313 |
| xx. 24 | 38 |
| xx. 29 | 143 |
| xxii. 5 | 419 |
| xxii. 18-21 | 333 |
| xxviii. 28 | 333 |
| Romans —xi. 11 | 333 |
| xi. 25 | 477 |
| xiii. 9 | 411 |
| 1 Corinthians —iv. 8 | 116 |
| v. 1 | 129 |
| ix. 5 | 196 |
| ix. 14 | 37 |
| x. 27 | 295 |
| xiv. 26 | 299 |
| xv. 5 | 187 |
| 2 Corinthians —v. 1 | 501 |
| ix. 6 | 259 |
| Ephesians —i. 6 | 56 |
| vi. 16 | 246 |
| Philippians —iii. 2 | 142 |
| Colossians —i. 13 | 56 |
| 1 Thessalonians —iii. 4 | 417 |
| iv. | 363 |
| 1 Timothy —iv. 1 | 248 |
| v. 18 | 296 |
| 2 Timothy —ii. 12 | 359 |
| iii. 12 | 417 |
| iv. 2 | 246 |
| Hebrews —i. 5 | 57 |
| iii. 2 | 191 |
| v. 5 | 57 |
| v. 4-6 | 206 |
| ix. 11 | 501 |
| St James —i. 4, 17 | 137 |
| ii. 11 | 411 |
| iii. 2 | 137 |

550 INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

| | Page | | Page |
|--------------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|
| St James —iii. 12 . . . | 144 | Revelation —iii. 17 . . . | 116 |
| iv. 9 . . . | 113 | vii. 9 . . . | 477 |
| v. 12 . . . | 112 | xii. 9 . . . | 61 |
| | | xx. 2 . . . | 61 |
| | | xx. 5-6 . . . | 453 |
| 1 John —iii. 15 . . . | 124 | xxii. 15 . . . | 142 |

PRINTED AT THE EDINBURGH PRESS
9 AND 11 YOUNG STREET

Date Due


| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| FACULTY | | | |
| N 26 '15 | | | |
| FACULTY | | | |
| DE 8 '52 | | | |
| LIBRARY | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
|  | | | |

sp
mit

BS2569 .S172

The human element in the Gospels

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00060 7475